

What Is “Democratic Socialism”?

“Democratic Socialism”—
the Ideology of Social Reformism

Ideological Trends
in “Democratic Socialism”

“Democratic Socialism” in Practice

The Groundless Social Reformist
Falsification of the
Democratic Nature
of Existing Socialism



PROGRESS
PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

The Ideological Struggle
in the International
Working-Class
Movement and the Problem
of Left Unity Today

1990

What Is "Democratic Socialism"?



PROGRESS
PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by *Barry Costello-Jones*
Designed by *G.N. Gubanov*

Contributors:

P. N. Fedoseyev (head of group), S. V. Alexandrov, G. L. Yeg-
nov, V. A. Kachanov, N. A. Kovalsky, A. E. Krukhmalev,
B. S. Orlov, S. N. Smirnov, V. A. Tumanov

ЧТО ТАКОЕ «ДЕМОКРАТИЧЕСКИЙ СОЦИАЛИЗМ»?

На английском языке

First printing 1980

© Политиздат, 1978

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1980, с изменениями

English translation © Progress Publishers 1980

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Ч 10506-191
016(01)-80

0302030900

CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Chapter I	
"Democratic Socialism" —the Ideology of Social Reformism	11
1. Pluralism or the Nebulous Concept of "Democratic Socialism"	11
2. The Origins and Results of Pluralism in the Concept of "Democratic Socialism"	17
3. The "Open" Concept of "Democratic Socialism". How "Pluralist" Is Its Pluralism?	27
4. The Aims and Purposes of "Democratic Socialism"	37
5. "Democratic Socialist" Reformism—a Means of Adjusting to Capi- talism	45
6. "Democratic Socialism"—a Variety of Anti-Communism	58
Chapter II	
Ideological Trends in "Democratic Socialism"	66
1. "Democratic Socialism" and the Right Revisionists and Renegades	66
2. The Left-Wing Catholics and Their Interpretation of Socialism	73
3. The Democratic Socialist Party of Japan	77
4. African "Democratic Socialism"—Attempts at Ideological Penetration in the Developing Countries	83
5. "Democratic Socialism" in Latin America	89
6. The Zionist Variety of "Democratic Socialism"	97
Chapter III	
"Democratic Socialism" in Practice	102
1. The Contradiction Between Theory and Practice	102
2. The Political Mechanism Remains Unchanged	104
3. Has the Economic Infrastructure Changed?	106
4. Politics in the Sphere of Social Services	110

Chapter IV

The Groundless Social Reformist Falsification of the Democratic Nature of Existing Socialism

	114
1. The Fundamental Difference Between Socialist and Bourgeois Democracy	114
2. Improving the Social Structure and the Development of the State of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat into the Socialist State of the Whole People	119
3. The Role of the Party in Socialist Society	125

Chapter V

The Ideological Struggle in the International Working-Class Movement and the Problem of Left Unity Today

	128
1. The Principles of Cooperation Between Communists and Social Democrats	128
2. The Main Stages in the History of Cooperation Between the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties	130
3. Communist Efforts to Expand Joint Action with the Social Democrats	136
Conclusion	142

INTRODUCTION

The building of socialist society in the USSR and a number of other countries has brought both the theory and practice of socialism to the centre of world social thought and made it the focal point of the class struggle. Millions of people throughout the world now see the destiny of humanity and the overall future of civilization to be increasingly linked with socialism.

World social development today shows convincingly that the creation of the necessary conditions for the solution of the global problems facing mankind depends upon socialism. In the utilization of modern scientific and technical advances in the interests of the working people, in the solution of energy and other problems related to the use of natural resources, in environmental conservation or the exploitation of the oceans riches, in space exploration or the fight against hunger and disease, in fact in any and every field of human endeavour that requires comprehensive, serious cooperation between countries, real (existing) socialism has made the most fruitful and significant contribution. The whole course of world development shows with increasing clarity that only through the socialist reconstruction of the world is it possible to solve the radical problems facing humanity. And it is precisely for this reason that mankind is more and more coming to realize that socialism holds the only feasible historical alternative to capitalism that is linked with the progressive development of human civilization.

"Already today socialism exercises a tremendous influence on the thinking and sentiment of hundreds of millions of people all over the world. It assures working people freedom, truly democratic rights, well-being, the broadest possible access to knowledge, and a firm sense of security. It brings peace, respect for the sovereignty

of all countries and equal interstate co-operation, and is a pillar of support to peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. And the immediate future is sure to provide new evidence of socialism's boundless possibilities, of its historical superiority over capitalism."¹

While the countries of the socialist community are achieving more and more success in all spheres of social life, trends are to be observed in the capitalist world which unquestionably point to an aggravation and deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. These include the discreditation of the state-monopoly system of economic regulation, which until only recently has been widely proclaimed as the means to overcoming the defects inherent in the spontaneous, unplanned and unstable capitalist economic system; the recent economic crises that have overtaken all the capitalist countries simultaneously; the unprecedented (in peacetime) inflation and disorganization of the capitalist monetary system; the rising unemployment and high prices; the raw-material, energy and economic crises; and the crisis facing the capitalist political system and bourgeois ideology, morality and culture. The contradiction between the relations of production and the productive forces under capitalism—the latter being radically transformed as a result of the scientific and technical revolution—has become particularly apparent due to the energy and raw-material crisis, the increasing pollution of the environment and the utilization of scientific and technical progress in the interests of militarization.

The successes achieved in the process of socialist and communist construction, the deepening of the crises phenomena in the capitalist world and the growth of the revolutionary struggle of the working class and all anti-imperialist forces provide undisputed practical confirmation of the correctness of the socialist path, which has Marxist-Leninist theory as its guiding light.

The attraction of socialist ideas for the working people of the world is now so great that not one political movement that aims to lead the mass of the people, gain their support and win a majority at the elections, can afford to disregard it.

Right across the political spectrum, parties and political groupings, including those which express the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie, are advancing today what are basically socialist slogans and elaborating theories of what they call a

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1976, pp. 13-14.

"third" or "genuinely socialist" path of development, which, of course, in actual fact, amount to no more than the ideas of social reformism given a face lift. In might be said that the majority of non-proletarian political parties today offer one or another interpretation of socialism and are desperately trying to pass themselves off as proponents of a socialist transformation of the world.

Obviously, by no means all those who talk about socialism do so for the purpose of actually bringing about the collapse of capitalism and the building of a socialist system. There are many and varied conceptions current as to what exactly constitutes socialism and what is the correct way to achieve it. Many of these conceptions amount to nothing more than bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideas on the future of the capitalist system done up in socialist phraseology. Some theories of socialism are even expressly designed as a means for combatting genuine scientific socialism. But despite all this one thing stands out clearly: *the fact that all classes and strata of society are discussing socialism is a characteristic feature of the modern world, in which existing socialism stands at the centre of events.*

Our age is the age of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism and communism which is being carried out under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. And this current of revolutionary transformation is hard to go against. Time and experience bring more and more proofs of the great vitality of socialism and the correctness of Marxist-Leninist teaching. Thus, a political party, which counts on winning over large sections of public opinion by means of openly attacking socialism and Marxism-Leninism, dooms itself to failure and defeat in the ideological struggle for the hearts and minds of people. For this reason many bourgeois ideologists are prepared to give verbal recognition to socialism and Marxism, while at the same time trying to distort and repudiate it. The opponents of socialism today are not content to simply condemn and falsify existing socialism: many of them assiduously don socialist clothing themselves, and one of the most widespread form of this "false socialism", so to speak, lies under the guise of what is generally termed "democratic socialism".

"Democratic socialism" in point of fact is the official ideology of the social-democratic parties, some of which are actually in power in the developed capitalist countries or share that power while some others find themselves at present in opposition. But the concept "democratic socialism" is intensively utilized by many political and ideological trends as offering supposedly the only

alternative to capitalism and to existing socialism. But the ideology of "democratic socialism" is used to oppose not so much capitalist ideology as the ideology of scientific communism and, in the same way, government by the right Social Democrats is designed to oppose government by the working people in existing socialist society.

"Democratic socialism" has frequently adapted itself to changing conditions and each time has become increasingly less socialist in content. Today we are once again witnessing a new outbreak of so-called theoretical activity occasioned by this concept, for the social-reformist parties of the West and the leadership of the Socialist International have in recent years been faced with the necessity of improving their manifestoes, which in their traditional form no longer exert their former influence on the masses.

"Democratic socialism" has now become an extremely heterogeneous mixture of ideas and is propagated by the representatives of numerous political currents. Primarily it is a concept advanced by social-democratic theoreticians either in the form of traditional "democratic socialism" as put forward by the right Social Democrats or in a somewhat modified form of "democratic socialism" as propagated by other social-democratic currents, which lay stress on what they refer to as "system-changing reforms". However, we also come across "democratic socialism" in the form of the "socialist models" of such ideologists as Garaudy, Fischer and Šik, who have split with their communist parties and are now advancing their own revisionist views in opposition to the actual record of the socialist construction. Yet another form of "democratic socialism" is that which appears as a flirtation with socialism on the part of the left-liberal bourgeois ideologists who attempt to find their own "socialist" alternative solution to the problems facing society. "Democratic socialism" is also rooted in the reformist ideas of the left Catholics, who are sharply critical of the vices of modern bourgeois society. It is seen again in that section of the youth in the capitalist world, which within the framework of the so-called New Left movement attempts to make up for its lack of theoretical grounding and its lack of clarity as to class positions with a purely emotional approach to the problems of society. Finally "democratic socialism" is widely exploited by proponents of Japanese, African and Latin American socialism as well as the advocates of so-called Zionist socialism, or Kibbutisism as it is termed and of various other trends and currents.

But whatever its colouring "democratic socialism" is a weapon in the arsenal of the revisionist and bourgeois ideologists. It is an ideology that is socialist in phraseology, but reformist and revisionist in essence, an ideology that seeks to oust the working class and the communist parties from their leading role in history and drown real socialism in a morass of empty bourgeois-liberal discussion on socialist transformations. "Democratic socialism", whatever its guise, is nothing more than a reformist and bourgeois alternative to existing socialism, which historically speaking is the only possible form of socialism.

For all the kaleidoscopic variation in the theoretical concepts and practical programmes which make appeal to "democratic socialism" they all have one characteristic in common—a denial of scientific socialism and its basic ideas on the necessity for the radical, revolutionary transformation of capitalist society, the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the whole system of capitalist social relations, and the leading role of the working class in eliminating the exploitation of man by man. In their attempts to distort the successes achieved by existing socialism in the socialist countries, the theoreticians of "democratic socialism" lay great stress on trying to show that the communist parties pay insufficient attention to developing democratic institutions whereas they advocate the unrestricted development of democracy.

But in reality these concepts of unrestricted democracy are nothing more than empty, abstract theoretical postulations based on a false, supra-class understanding of the nature of democracy. They take no account of the objective dependence of democracy on the concrete conditions and level of development of a given society. The basic formula for "democratic socialism" despite its name is not "socialism plus democracy", but "democracy minus socialism" or "democracy for the sake of democracy". It is an abstract democracy divorced from the concrete conditions which is propagated by the adherents of "democratic socialism".

"Democratic socialism" as an ideology is designed to draw the working class away from the struggle for the radical transformation of capitalist society, the struggle that is waged under the banner of socialism, and fight instead under the banner of abstract democracy for the gradual reform of capitalism which leaves the foundations of the capitalist system untouched. It is an ideology which is aimed at splitting the ranks of the international workers' movement by opposing the struggle for socialism to the struggle for the democratization, which to all intents and purposes amounts to separating democracy from socialism entirely.

The theoreticians of "democratic socialism" represent it as a kind of "third way" which allegedly avoids the "extremes" of either capitalism or communism and gives rise to a new system of social democracy.

"Democratic socialism" as a political concept appears as a motley of reformist, revisionist and liberal-bourgeois ideas.

But although "democratic socialism" is a theoretically amorphous concept, which runs contrary to the laws of the real world, it nevertheless carries the hopes of many rank-and-file Social Democrats as well as many young Socialists and anti-capitalist members of the intelligentsia who see it as the means to the realization of their socialist ideals. This is explained first of all by the fact that under the influence of a furious campaign launched by monopoly capital against the communist parties and existing socialism part of the socialistically-minded strata of the working people are inclined to seek out "new models of socialism", and second by the increased propaganda spread throughout the socialist and social-democratic parties which puts forward purely formal and unsubstantiated repudiations of scientific socialism and declares "democratic socialism" as the only alternative to capitalism.

To show that the concept of "democratic socialism" has no basis in science will surely help to solidify the ranks of the international working-class movement, to fortify the unity of the workers, and contribute to the victory of socialism.

Chapter I

"DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM"— THE IDEOLOGY OF SOCIAL REFORMISM

1. Pluralism or the Nebulous Concept of "Democratic Socialism"

As has already been pointed out "democratic socialism" has now become a weapon in the arsenal of many and varied ideological and political opponents of scientific socialism. But first and foremost it is the official ideology of the social-democratic and other contemporary reformist parties.

It could be said that "democratic socialism" is synonymous with the socio-political doctrine of modern social democracy as officially laid down in the latter's programme documents. It thus acts the part of the theoretical and ideological servant of the social-democratic movement.

But despite the abundance of works by social-reformist theoreticians devoted to the concept of "democratic socialism", it still remains amorphous, vague and eclectic, a mish-mash of political theory. As the adherents of "democratic socialism" themselves claim the specific characteristic of this concept is its almost unlimited pluralism of views. According to the programme declaration of the Socialist International entitled "Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism" adopted at its First Congress (Frankfurt on the Main, 1951), "Socialism is an international movement which does not demand a rigid uniformity of approach. Whether Socialists build their faith on Marxist or other methods of analysing society, whether they are inspired by religious or humanitarian principles, they all strive for the same goal—a system of social justice, better living, freedom and world peace."¹

The member parties of the Socialist International tend to avoid

¹ *Declarations of the Socialist International*. Published by the Socialist International, London, 1964, pp. 3-4.

discussion of theoretical questions considering that they are better dealt with internally by each party.¹

This sort of "pluralist" approach to matters of theory in the social-democratic movement results in almost every social-democratic party having what is virtually its own specific concept of "democratic socialism" which in one way or another differs from those of the other parties. Furthermore, within the various parties themselves there are differences of understanding over the fundamental questions of social transformation and this further contributes to the variety of interpretation which is given to the idea of "democratic socialism". The only thing uniting Social Democrats of all countries is their reference to observing the principles of democracy (by which is meant the bourgeois parliamentary system), and this is seen as the main condition for the building of socialism, whereas the theoretical elaboration of socialism itself is considered the business of each party, containing as it does no clear-cut scientific criteria. The most general characteristic allowing a given party to state that its position is "democratic socialist" is nothing more than the proclaimed intention to turn society on to the path of socialism (and a socialism, incidentally, which is interpreted differently each time, as we shall see below) while observing the principles of "pluralist democracy". But the approaches to this general understanding of "democratic socialism" adopted by the different member parties of the Socialist International are quite different. Furthermore, a kaleidoscope of views exists within the parties themselves. In reply to the question: "What is socialism?", Olof Palme, President of the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Sweden, said: "There are 71 definitions of socialism. If I were to give the 72nd, it would not make things any easier. There is no generally accepted definition."²

This means in practice the absence of any structurally integrated theory to give "democratic socialism" a scientific grounding as a specific social-democratic and socialist model of the economic, political, social and cultural rebuilding of the world on socialist principles and of the transformation of anti-humanitarian capitalism into a humanitarian social system.

Thus a paradoxical picture emerges of a social-democratic

movement comprising some 65 parties and organizations which has no clearly defined concept of the process of social reconstruction. In practice the Social Democrats are holding up the white flag in the face of the capitalist system of social relations, declaring them to be inherent in the very nature of man and rejecting as what they call a "Marxist utopia" the possibility of building a society in which "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all"¹. And it is precisely for this reason that the social-democratic reformist movement in general experiences no particular need for a structurally integrated theory of "democratic socialism" as a specific social system, which reformists oppose with no valid grounding both to the capitalist system and to the system of existing socialism. Being unwilling to take real and practical measures that would alter the foundations of capitalist society, the advocates of "democratic socialism" have no real need for serious, scientifically elaborated concepts of the theoretical and ideological alternatives to be advanced in opposition to capitalism. Evidently they have realized that their reformist and conciliatory positions would be seriously threatened by a carefully elaborated, structurally integrated and scientifically grounded theory for the real and practical transition from capitalism to socialism. The "plurality", which is to say nebulosity, of the theoretical concepts of "democratic socialism" serves only to mask the complete bankruptcy of this theory which hopes to turn capitalism into socialism by reform.

The views which go to make up the concept of "democratic socialism" have evolved like the practical programmes of the social-democratic movement. This evolution, however, has not led to a deeper understanding or greater clarification of its theoretical foundations, but rather to its still greater amorphousness and eclecticism.

This eclecticism stands out in any account of "democratic socialism". The theoretical organ of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, *Die neue Gesellschaft*, states, for example, that: "The Christian doctrine of man's image and its ethical dimensions, the human rights proclaimed by the French Revolution, Kantian enlightenment and ethics, the Hegelian dialectical theory of history, the Marxian critique of capitalism, Bernstein's critical Marxism, Rosa Luxemburg's theory of spontaneity and critique of

¹ Alan J. Day, "Two Faces of Democratic Socialism". In: *Socialist Commentary*, London, May 1971, p. 11.

² Quoted from *Experience in and Prospects for Joint Action of Communists and Social Democrats*, Moscow, 1974, p. 271 (in Russian).

¹ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party". In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 506.

Bolshevism, Schumacher's free-thinking socialism and the latest contributions of Ernst Bloch, Horkheimer and Adorno, Habermas, Leszek Kolakowski, Milovan Djilas and others, may be described as consecutive and interlocking acts of cognition of a democratic socialism which are traceable to one ethical motive."¹

Trying to pass off a vice as a virtue, the ideologists of social reformism would have their vague concepts of "democratic socialism" seen as "breadth of views" and "forthrightness" of ideology. But it is interesting to note that in their interpretation of pluralism as something positive, which gives the concept of "democratic socialism" its flexibility and democratic nature, the very proponents of the concept themselves sense that in reality pluralism amounts to nothing more than theoretical and practical impotence, from which there is little political capital to be gained. It is no doubt for this reason that in the early 1970s the call has been made with increasing intensity among the theoreticians of "democratic socialism" for the elaboration, at least in general outline, of some integral theory of "democratic socialism", which would reflect the views of social-democratic movement in Western Europe as a whole. In 1972 Alan Day noted that both inside and outside the EEC there was a growing demand for an integral social-democratic concept of the organization of society. "The ideological offensive of the Social Democrats," he emphasized, "requires the elaboration of such a concept."²

In recent times these calls of the ideologists of "democratic socialism" for a more or less integral and coherent concept have somewhat abated. The topic is no longer relevant in social-democratic literature. But this latest development has not taken place because the adherents of "democratic socialism" are no longer in need of a single theory of the essentials of social democracy, of which they declare themselves to be the champions. What has happened rather is that they are simply not able to create such a theory. One example of this has been the futility of attempts to replace the current Socialist International programme, which was drawn up in Frankfurt in 1951, with a new programme, document that would establish the positions of the member parties of the International. Despite the fact that the Felipe González commission appointed by the 23rd Congress has been working on

this document since 1976, it failed to prepare even a more or less coherent programme declaration of contemporary social-democratic movement by the next Congress in Vancouver.

In the working-class movement today important political changes are taking place. They are expressed first of all in a definite shift to the left among the workers' organizations in the capitalist countries, in the growth of mass demonstrations by workers and other progressive forces against the domination of monopoly capital and also in a strengthening of the leading role of the working class in the struggle of all the working peoples for their rights and for radical changes in capitalist society.

Under the influence of objective social and political shifts, new trends are also to be observed within the international social-democratic movement. Important among these is the process of differentiation which is taking place in the ranks of the social-democratic and socialist movement, particularly between the right Social Democrats who stand for the stabilization of state-monopoly capitalism and the left Social Democrats who are increasingly supporting the working-class demands for disassociation from imperialist policies and for normalization of relations with the communist parties. This process is, of course, complex and highly contradictory. It affects relations both between social-democratic parties (including the member parties of the Socialist International) and within the individual parties, between their right-wing leaders and rank-and-file members, who see socialism as an alternative to capitalism.

But at the same time the tendency to seek a compromise approach should not be discounted. By compromise is meant some middle way between the views of the right Social Democrats and those of the left Socialists. This tendency, which has appeared in a number of parties, has an objective foundation. Changes in the social structure of society, higher levels of occupational qualifications among the workers, greater numbers of white-collar workers, increased cultural requirements by the working people together with a number of other circumstances have all combined to exert an influence on the social basis of social democracy and correspondingly on its general attitudes. Social democracy in the FRG has recently advanced the concept of a "new middle". Willy Brandt, who has been most active in developing this concept, suggests that in capitalist society today there is a stratum of what he describes as the "most conscious citizens", which is comprised of highly-qualified workers, white-collar workers and the intelligentsia who form the bulwark of social democracy. This "new

¹ Max Schäfer, "Democratic Socialism in SPD Theory and Politics". In: *World Marxist Review*, No. 8, 1973, p. 10.

² Alan J. Day, "Die ideologische Offensive der Sozialdemokratie". In: *Die neue Gesellschaft*, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, No. 6, 1972, p. 456.

middle" is posing the question with increasing urgency as to the further improvement of political and social democracy and the raising of the "quality of life". Brandt claims that it is vital for social democracy to meet these requirements.

The politics and ideology of social democracy as a reformist workers' party are characterized by two opposing class tendencies. One of these is comprised of the interests of the working people, who form the overwhelming majority of the membership and supporters of the social-democratic parties, while the other is comprised of the right-wing leadership of social-democratic parties, whose interests are associated with the bourgeoisie. It is within the framework of the struggle between these two trends that the internal development of social democracy takes place. Account of this circumstance is particularly important, since it is precisely here that the possibilities are rooted for union between the social-democratic parties, their joint cooperation and their unity of action either with the communist parties (as a result of the first tendency) or with the bourgeois parties (as a result of the second).

Phenomena that have taken place in recent years within the social-democratic movement are, therefore, of an unavoidably contradictory character and are not always susceptible to simple evaluation. But at the same time their analysis permits us to state with a certain degree of reliability that, in the first place, definite positive changes have taken place in the foreign policies of the social-democratic parties and, second, that there has been a certain strengthening of the trend to maintaining contacts and cooperation with the communist parties.

The evolution of the ideas of "democratic socialism" is simply the theoretical reflection of the growing differentiation and split within the ranks of the social reformists. Pluralism serves as the theoretical and ideological expression of their lack of unity and coherence.

At the same time, however, it must be pointed out that for all its variety and nebulousness the ideological doctrine of "democratic socialism" has remained throughout the course of its development resolutely and continuously opposed to Marxism-Leninism and existing socialism.

Thus with due regard for what has just been said, it must be clearly stated that an analysis of the concept of "democratic socialism" as an integral and clearly expressed theory and ideology of contemporary social-democratic and socialist reformism is out of the question, for such a clear-cut concept simply does not exist. Therefore, to understand what is meant by "democratic socialism"

and pluralism it is necessary first to look back into history and examine the evolution of the social reformists' approach to the fundamental questions of social reconstruction, indicating at the same time the political forces which gave rise to the pluralistic vagueness which characterizes this concept, and then through an analysis of "democratic socialism" as it exists today to show the doctrinal differences between the various social-democratic factions and trends as well as the differences between them and the left social reformist movement which is aligned to them in theory and practice.

2. The Origins and Results of Pluralism in the Concept of "Democratic Socialism"

"Democratic socialism" may be traced back to the origins of opportunism and revisionism. The causes of opportunism in the ranks of the workers' movement and the origins of revisionism as an ideological current have been examined in the works of Marxists from various countries, but particularly in Lenin's "Marxism and Revisionism", "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky" and "Left-Wing" Communism—*Infantile Disorder*. The objective social roots of opportunism and revisionism were linked by Lenin primarily with the petty-bourgeois strata of society. These strata, according to Lenin, "surround the proletariat on every side with a petty-bourgeois atmosphere, which permeates and corrupts the proletariat, and constantly causes among the proletariat relapses into petty-bourgeois spinelessness, disunity, individualism, and alternating moods of exaltation and dejection".¹

The main causes of opportunist and revisionist political currents in the working-class movement were seen by Lenin to have resulted from the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology together with imperialist pressure brought to bear on the working-class movement through buying off the working-class leadership, which results in the formation of a "workers' aristocracy" and a "workers' bureaucracy". Having once revealed the social basis for opportunism and revisionism within the working-class movement, Lenin went on to give an exhaustive and fundamental analysis of these political currents. He characterized petty-bourgeois re-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism—An Infantile Disorder", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1966, pp. 44.

formism as "servility to the bourgeoisie covered by a cloak of sentimental democratic and 'Social'-Democratic phrases and fatuous wishes".¹ Lenin showed that no matter what the subjective intentions of the revisionists were, objectively they functioned as allies of capitalism, not socialism. He then went on to reveal the essence of revisionist politics: "To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chopping and changing of petty politics, to forget the primary interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the whole capitalist system, of all capitalist evolution, to sacrifice these primary interests for real or assumed advantages of the moment—such is the policy of revisionism."²

The elaboration of the concept of "democratic socialism" was begun in the German social-democratic movement and associated with the development of revisionist and opportunist currents.

Very probably the founding father, so to speak, of the ideas which lay at the root of "democratic socialism" was Eduard Bernstein. It was his assertions of the necessity for the social-democratic movement to concentrate its attention on reforms as the main road to socialism that became the cornerstone of the ideological platform of revisionism. In a series of articles of *Die neue Zeit* (1897-1898), the organ of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, he made the first attempt at the theoretical substantiation of the role of social democracy as the party of social reforms operating within the capitalist system. Despite this, however, Bernstein still considered that he held a Marxist position and thought of himself as one of Marx's critical pupils.

Thus revisionism in earliest form, while distorting the essence of Marxism, continued to recognize Marxism as its theoretical foundation. According to Bernstein and his followers, it was simply a matter of changing tactics in conformity with the changing situation in the capitalist countries.

But Bernstein's theories are characterized by their internal contradictions. On the one hand there is recognition of the necessity for proletarian class struggle. But at the same time his interpretation of democracy, rights and freedoms is such as to virtually nullify the class struggle while tacitly recognizing the right to existence of the capitalist state based as it is on private property.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "New Times and Old Mistakes in a New Guise", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, 1966, p. 21.

² V. I. Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, 1963, pp. 37-38.

This fundamental contradiction gave rise to a number of different approaches in the later evolution of the concept of "democratic socialism", which may be divided into two basic political trends.

One of these, adopting a non-class position, considers analysis of the problems of freedom and democracy to be fundamental, and for this reason approximates to the ideological position of the bourgeois liberals. In social-democratic literature this trend has become known as liberal or left-liberal, and it may be remembered that Bernstein himself used to refer to socialism as the "completion of liberalism".¹ Half a century later Bruno Kreisky, one of the modern advocates of the liberal trend in social democracy, repeated the same idea, stressing that "for many years now the social-democratic movement has been victoriously developing the 'ideas of liberalism'".²

Formally the "liberal" Social Democrats do not deny Marxism, but in practice they distort it by concentrating only on that part of the theoretical heritage of Marx and Engels which treats the role of the individual and the right and freedoms of the individual, and artificially abstracting these questions from the whole conceptual framework of Marxism where they are seen in the light of the problems confronting the restructuring of capitalist society. Hence their particular interest in Marx's early works.

The second of these trends in the evolution of the ideas of "democratic socialism" is characterized as "Marxist". This trend comprises those Social Democrats, who while recognizing a number of the fundamental tenets of Marxism, including the necessity for the revolutionary transformation of society, nevertheless deny the dictatorship of the proletariat and criticize the methods for building a new society in the socialist countries.

These two trends appear differently in different parties dependent upon the conditions obtaining in any given country. At different stages they approximate to each other, sometimes intermingling, sometimes splitting as they reflect the complex processes taking place within the social-democratic movement. But they stem from the heterogeneity of the social base of social democracy, comprising both significant sections of the working class and other social groups affected by elements of petty-bourgeois ideology.

¹ See: Karl Kautsky, *Le marxisme et son critique Bernstein*, P.-V. Stock, Paris, 1900, p. 325.

² Bruno Kreisky, "Viele sind Revolutionäre aus Bequemlichkeit". In: *Der Spiegel*, No. 10, 1972, p. 111.

In contemporary conditions the social and political shifts in the capitalist countries and the growing intensification of contradictions in capitalist society, on the one hand, and the growing influence of the socialist countries on world social development, on the other, have sharpened the ideological demarcation within the social-democratic and socialist parties which has existed covertly from the very birth of social reformism. Serious changes have taken place in the social composition of the member parties of the Socialist International. Social democracy, being a complex conglomerate of political forces, continues to rely primarily on the working class. But over the last few decades it has succeeded in winning over a large section of the middle strata—white-collar workers, intelligentsia, small independent producers and craftsmen—and the students, whose numbers in recent years have been increasingly supplemented by those who come either from middle strata, approximating in their social status to the workers, or from the working-class and peasant families. This change in social composition cannot but be reflected in the attitudes of the parties. While the situation of the white-collar workers and students, whose numbers are continually increasing, is becoming more and more similar to that of the working class, with whom they are beginning to find a common language (particularly over such demands as relate to the guaranteed rights of workers to participate in production management and government at all levels), the high salary brackets, including top civil servants and high-ranking executives, are beginning to advocate a "technocratic" solution to the social problems facing capitalist society, thereby adopting a position which is close to that of the bourgeois liberals.

Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that the views of the Social Democrats are formulated within the cultural climate of capitalist society, where bourgeois ideology, designed to defend the foundations of state-monopoly capitalism, holds the dominant position.

The views of the various social currents within social democracy are reflected in various ideological approaches to and theoretical elaborations of the concept of "democratic socialism". In those parties where economism and trade unionism hold sway, there are no attempts at serious theoretical analysis of this concept, and reformism is seen here in its most blatant form. But in those parties where the traditions of the working class' political struggle are strong and where the middle strata and students are significantly represented, theoretical studies of "democratic socialism" tend either towards Marxism, or towards bourgeois liberalism,

supplemented in recent years by technocratic concepts founded on the basis of "critical rationalism".

The fact that throughout the whole ideological history of social democracy there can be traced the influence of Marxism, on the one hand, and bourgeois liberalism, on the other, is something which is recognized by the Social Democrats themselves. Of course, they point out that "democratic socialism" offers its own interpretation of both Marxism and liberalism. From Marxist teaching "democratic socialism" is supposed to take its methodology and realization of the necessity for an active solution to social problems, while liberalism allegedly provides "democratic socialism" with real guarantees of the basic values of human society—freedom, equality and solidarity.

In actual fact, however, this methodology, which has been borrowed from Marxism after dispensing with Marxist theory, particularly the teaching on socialism as the first stage on the road to communism, has in the "democratic socialist" understanding of the term been given an exclusively formal character. For in Marxism methodology does not exist as some external, independent supplement to its theory of the laws of social development and the revolutionary transformation of social reality. System and method in Marxism are organically linked aspects of its teaching. It is precisely the Marxist system of theoretical postulates, reflecting as they do the laws of social development, which provides simultaneously a general methodology of cognition and the means to the transformation of social reality. It is therefore impossible to utilize Marxist methodology while at the same time discarding certain aspects of its theory and teaching on social development. Rejection of the theoretical tenets of Marxism in point of fact means rejecting Marxist methodology. Thus when the "democratic socialists" say that they use Marxist methodology but refute Marxist teaching on socialism, the socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc., this is merely demagogic phraseology designed to give the impression that they are genuine Marxists and delude the working class into thinking that their conception of "democratic socialism" is essentially Marxist in character. The revolutionary Marxist method cannot be mixed with the liberalism of "democratic socialism". Furthermore, this liberalism, which is, more and more acquiring the characteristic outlook of a certain section of the bourgeoisie, leads in the end to the evaporation of Marxist methodology and the Marxist revolutionary approach to the cognition and transformation of social reality. Either the theory and methodology of Marxism must

be accepted, that is to say Marxism in its entirety, or the theory and methodology of liberalism—there can be no other realistic alternative. For the combination of Marxist methodology and the liberal theory of social development becomes such a hotch-potch of inconsistency that it inevitably turns out to be pure liberalism, quite divorced from Marxism as the whole history of “democratic socialism” shows.

But at the basis of the pluralist concept of “democratic socialism” we not only find Bernstein’s idea of “humanizing” the class struggle, which in fact turned “democratic socialism” into a theory of class peace with the bourgeoisie, in other words, the theory and practice of social partnership. Kautsky’s revisionist theories which were aimed at one of the most important tenets of Marxist theory—the dictatorship of the proletariat—also played an important role in the development of “democratic socialism”. These theories on the “undemocratic nature” of the dictatorship of the proletariat and Kautsky’s repudiation of a class approach to the problems of democracy and proletarian power led “democratic socialism” into the morass of anti-communism. The fullest expression of his revisionist views is contained in his work entitled *Die Diktatur des Proletariats* (1918) where he criticizes the Bolsheviks for failing to observe the “norms of democracy” in the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Kautsky’s work *Die Diktatur des Proletariats* became a cornerstone in the theoretical elaboration of anti-communism, which the Social Democrats began to practice from that time on. Its influence on the subsequent formation of the concept of “democratic socialism” was also expressed in the fact that it lay at the foundation of the theories of the left “Marxist” group. But even the left theoreticians of “democratic socialism”, who recognize a number of the principal theses of Marxism (such as the necessity for socialization of the means of production as a fundamental condition of socialism, etc.) combine their degenerate Marxism with the fully fledged anti-communism of “liberal” Social Democrats.

In the twenties and thirties “democratic socialism” slowly began to evolve out of the various currents of revisionism. The acceptance of philosophical compromise after the fashion of Kant, the study of the problematics of “ethical socialism”, the appearance of the theory of “free social economics”, which contained an attempt to unite the principles of the capitalist market economy with socialism, the discussions on the role of the state in contemporary capitalist society and theory of political pluralism, which was essentially a denial of the concept of the dictatorship of the

proletariat were all later adopted by the ideologists of social democracy in their attempt to form an integral concept of “democratic socialism”. But the main thrust of all these ideological efforts was always against communism through attempts to accuse existing socialism of violating democracy and human rights.

Before the fascists came to power in Italy and Germany and before the outbreak of the Second World War the concept of “democratic socialism” as such had not been formulated. Its contours were far too diffuse. The social-democratic leaders had still not decided to make a complete and open break with the Marxists by virtue of the prestige of the latter’s teaching among the working people. But at the same time amid all this diffuseness one fundamental characteristic of “democratic socialism” had made its appearance. Whichever trend or faction we look at in the movement, whether it be the liberal Social Democrats, who as a rule held the leading positions in the parties, or the left Socialists who did not reject their connection with the Marxists, we inevitably come up against anti-communism and the condemnation of existing socialism.

The new stage in the theoretical work of the Social Democrats which began after the Second World War led to no change in the anti-communist outlook of “democratic socialism”. Of course, the leading role played by the Soviet Army in crushing Hitler’s war machine, the joint action by Communists and Social Democrats in the Resistance, the discreditation of capitalism as the social system which gave rise to fascism and many other circumstances encouraged the Social Democrats to take a more critical position in relation to bourgeois society. But at the same time the adherents of “democratic socialism” continued to be firm in their anti-communism.

After the Second World War social democracy made a final break with scientific socialism and turned more and more towards anti-communism. It was during this period—the fifties and sixties—that the concept of “democratic socialism” began to be advanced as the ideological platform of international social democracy, that was sharply directed against existing socialism. The fullest expression of this was contained in the Frankfurt Declaration of the Socialist International, which was mentioned above. According to the social-democratic historian, Julius Braunthal, it was the first document in which Social Democrats openly renounced the idea of the historical inevitability of socialism. The Frankfurt Declaration contains no statement of

adherence to Marxism, which is equated with other ideological and political currents that might be utilized by Social Democrats in their efforts to create a "society of social justice". As the Austrian social-democratic ideologist Karl Czernetz points out, the Frankfort Declaration bears the mark of compromise. It contains a critique of capitalism, a critique of imperialist colonial domination and a recognition that capitalism had sharpened the class struggle and that in certain countries monopoly capital had supported fascism and its barbaric methods. The Declaration proclaims its intention to "replace capitalism by a system in which the public interest takes precedence over the interest of private profit".¹

But, on the other hand, the Declaration avoids the key question as to how capitalism is to be liquidated as a social formation that is deeply antithetical to the interests of the working people. Nor does the definition of "democratic socialism" which it formulates answer this question. "Democratic socialism," the Declaration states, "aims at extending individual freedom on the basis of economic and social security and an increasing prosperity."² This and other formulations regarding the new social system are far too vague and diffuse in character. In effect they leave the foundations of capitalism untouched, while at the same time making vicious attacks against the world's first socialist state and declaring that it lacks democracy and that it is dominated by "state monopoly" and "totalitarian planning".

The Frankfort Declaration provides no theoretical grounding for the concept of "democratic socialism", although it is here in this document that for the first time "democratic socialism" appears as the stated aim of social democracy. But, on the other hand, the tendentiously anti-communist character of "democratic socialism" was given its final touches. Henceforth the anti-Soviet attacks contained in the document made the Frankfort Declaration an anti-communist credo which found the support of all proponents of the cold war.

Over a period of many years the leaders of the social-democratic parties have been trying to "deideologize" the workers' movement claiming that no theory is needed for it. The thesis advanced by Kurt Schumacher in 1946 on "Weltanschauung neutrality" was endorsed not only in the programme declaration of the Socialist International but also in the Basic Programme of the Social

¹ *Declarations of the Socialist International*, pp. 4, 5, 6.

² *Ibid.*

Democratic Party of Germany¹ and in a number of other social-democratic documents.

The thesis on "freedom from ideology" advanced by the Social Democrats nevertheless had a definite ideological and political aim which was to justify the final break with Marxism, ideologically disarm the working class, undermine the influence and authority of Marxist-Leninist teaching and win votes from the bourgeois parties.

But the realities of the class struggle, the tremendous upsurge in the workers' movement during the sixties and seventies, the increasing differentiation in the ranks of the social-democratic parties, the growth of the influence of Marxist-Leninist ideology and the far greater public interest in Marxism-Leninism have compelled the social-democratic leaders and ideologists to revise their positions regarding this so-called freedom from ideology. But the slogan itself, which is far from obsolete, is now being put forward to the accompaniment of more intensive searchings for a "new sound alternative" to Marxism-Leninism.

In the present "ideological search" for new slogans to win over large sections of the working people it is the right-wing, anti-communist ideologists and social-democratic leaders that have intensified their efforts considerably, insofar as they are justifiably anxious about their positions in the leadership of the social-democratic parties. This evidently explains the fact that these "searches" are largely conducted in the pernicious atmosphere of anti-communism and capitalist apologia. This at any rate characterises the present campaign of "reideologization" which is the aim of all these fruitless attempts to find a "third way" between communism and capitalism.

The reverse side, as it were, of the anti-communist concepts of social democracy are the apologia for the capitalist system which form together with it an integral whole. This side of "democratic socialist" ideology is apparent in the denial of the necessity for radical social change in the capitalist system and the rejection of the socialist revolution and is made most clearly evident in the economic and political theory of social democracy and its approach to the key social and political problems facing imperialism today. These and other related issues have been fairly fully treated by

¹ This programme, the first to be declared after the war by the SDPG, was adopted at the congress in Bad Godesberg in 1959. It contained an attempt to give theoretical foundation to the concept of "democratic socialism".

Soviet scholars since the war and the main conclusions reached have been irrefutably supported by recent events.

The whole Babylonian tower of hope in the possibility of an evolutionary road to socialism is based on the unsound and long refuted thesis of the "transformation of capitalism". Here the ideological kinship between the bourgeois and the social reformist theoreticians is blatantly exposed. The present period of "reideologization", like the period of "the end of ideology" before it, has done nothing to change the apologetic character of the doctrine of "democratic socialism". It has undergone no substantial change since the time of the Frankfurt Declaration. And such changes as there have been have largely been directed towards a more complex masking of the class nature of state-monopoly capitalism and its fundamental contradictions. This is not to say, of course, that the social-democratic (as indeed the bourgeois-liberal) ideologists blind themselves as to the vices of the capitalist system. To do so would be practically impossible insofar as they are plainly evident to the working people. But the Social Democrats do not wish to consider the objective character of the contradictions of capitalism that are rooted in its very nature as an exploitative system preferring to set their hopes on gradually overcoming these contradictions by means of the scientific and technical revolution and the utilization of state control. The latest social remedies—such as for example the "improvement of the quality of life" and the setting up of a "National Fund of Workers' Capital" as proposed by the British Labour party—are just as narrowly-reformist in character as those of the past and are only designed to guide the workers' movement away from the solution of the cardinal problems facing capitalist society. "Up till now," declared Tiden (No. 7-8, 1972), the theoretical organ of the Swedish Social Democratic Labour Party which had been in power for forty years, "we have made use of every available opportunity and tried to be better capitalists than the capitalists themselves."

Thus from the very beginning theoreticians have given the concept of "democratic socialism" a clear ideological orientation, intensifying its "pluralism" against the theory and practice of the building of communism. The concept is characterized by two basic trends. In the first place its ideological framework is composed of a rejection of the Marxist understanding of socialism as a stage on the road to a new socio-economic formation, based on social ownership of the means of production, the replacement of the Marxist understanding of socialism by a pluralist, abstract and

imprecise definition of socialism as the embodiment of what are essentially bourgeois interpretations of the political and ethical ideas of freedom, justice, solidarity, etc., and the struggle against scientific socialism as it is practiced in the USSR and the other socialist countries. Second, the concept of "democratic socialism" is characterized by a proclaimed policy for the evolutionary transformation of the capitalist system into a socialist system by means of a strict adherence to the principles of bourgeois parliamentary democracy and this is stated to be the only feasible and acceptable way for social democracy.

The concept of "democratic socialism" was worked out with a two-fold aim in view. On the one hand, it was designed to make the ideological and political credo of the bourgeoisie attractive to the large sections of the population, who were already subject to the influence of the various bourgeois political parties (Conservatives, Christian-Democrats and Liberals); on the other, it was intended to provide an understanding of socialism and methods of socialist building which could be opposed to the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, the real changes taking place within the socialist countries and the revolutionary programmes for the transition to socialism as advanced by the communist parties in the capitalist countries.

3. The "Open" Concept of "Democratic Socialism". How "Pluralist" Is Its Pluralism?

The proponents of "democratic socialism" see one of the essential characteristics of their concept to lie in what they describe as its "openness". According to West German Social Democrat Peter Ludz "Democratic socialism is considered as a fundamentally open theory which attempts to incorporate all the many and varied phenomena of daily life and their intellectual manifestation, including of course such as emanate from Marxism."¹

Recently "democratic socialist" ideologists have been trying to make critical rationalism of the type elaborated by Karl Popper stand as the philosophical basis of their open concept. This is shown, for example, by discussions within the SDPG as reflected in the three-volume *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie* (Critical Rationalism and Social Democracy). Critical rationalism as they see it is both an approach to cognition and a political philosophy. As a theory of knowledge it is founded on the principle

¹ Peter Christian Ludz, "Die Ideologie des Sozialdemokratismus aus der Sicht der Kommunisten". In: *Die neue Gesellschaft*, No. 5, 1972, p. 359.

of continuous criticism and reassessment of theory on a supposedly empirical basis. The progress of knowledge is seen to be the result of the elimination of refuted theories and their replacement by fresh ones. This process which is constantly being renewed was characterized by Popper as "the method of bold hypotheses and serious, meaningful experiment directed towards their refutation".¹

This method, according to Popper, takes into account the limits of our knowledge and their continuing change as one theory replaces another and we gradually approach nearer to the truth. "The method," he declares, "is rational insofar as it has faith in human reason and its cognitive powers. But it is also self-critical insofar as it is aware of the boundaries of reason. It raises the search for mistakes and their eradication to the level of a methodological principle."² This same principle determines the character of critical rationalism as a political philosophy supposedly opposed to utopias and the other various political monopolies on the truth. "In the free competition of ideas under democracy it sees the only *rational* form of political conflict."³ The link between the philosophical traditions of social democracy and the political philosophy of "critical rationalism" is seen by the "democratic socialist" theoreticians to consist in the fact that they both recognize criticism of reality as the motive force of progress and defend democracy as a rational form of political conflict.

Thus, the "democratic socialists" themselves, in accordance with the philosophy of critical rationalism, proclaim the "open" concept of "democratic socialism" as the "free competition of ideas" emphasizing at the same time its criticism of reality.

But this so-called free competition of ideas is, in the "democratic socialist" understanding of the term, by no means free. In point of fact the adherents of "democratic socialism" admit only certain quite definite ideas, which boil down to nothing more than such social reformist thesis as conform with it *a priori*, that is, before any competition and critical analysis, and which amount, on the one hand, to capitalist apologia and, on the other, to a criticism of existing socialism. This actual limitation on the "openness" of the concept of "democratic socialism" makes nonsense of the "democratic socialist" thesis that criticism of reality is the motive

force of progress. For this criticism of reality turns out to be a criticism not of reality as a whole, but of the realities of socialism as it is practiced in the socialist countries. The criticism of capitalism as it exists becomes in the concept of "democratic socialism", despite the general philosophical declarations to the contrary, a eulogy of bourgeois democracy and an apologia for the capitalist system. It might be thought that bourgeois democracy, insofar as it comes under the category of "reality", should in accordance with critical rationalist philosophy also be subjected to the criticism of the "democratic socialists". But in fact their criticism of reality as the motive force of progress is extremely one-sided. The action of this motive force is never directed at the concept of "democratic socialism" itself, but only against that which opposes it, that is to say not against capitalist society with its distorted democracy but against scientific socialism and the society of existing socialism and socialist democracy. The "democratic socialists" have indeed a strange understanding of the criticism of reality as the motive force of progress!

The liberal theoreticians of "democratic socialism" claim that the "open" character of their concept (which comes from critical rationalism as its philosophical basis) allows it to avoid dogmatism, absorb the cultural values of humanity and answer problems that could not be considered by philosophers in the past. Thus *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie* claims that critical rationalism is essentially "anti-dogmatic" and "anti-authoritarian".

But in reality the philosophical basis of "democratic socialism" is just as one-sided and selective in what might be called its "anti-dogmatic" and "anti-authoritarian" aspect as it is in its criticism. The anti-dogmatism and anti-authoritarianism of "democratic socialism", whatever they may be called in theory, turn out in practice to be nothing more than opposition to the basic tenets and authority of Marxism, which are denounced by the "democratic socialists" as "obsolete dogma". It is their intention to "save" the concept of "democratic socialism" from the authority of Marx's teaching, but in propagating their anti-dogmatism, the "democratic socialists" in fact are just as dogmatic over the teaching of Kant. In propagating anti-dogmatism they themselves raise "ethical realism" and "critical rationalism" as well as other bourgeois-idealistic concepts to the level of dogma.

While propagating the anti-authoritarian character of "democratic socialist" teaching the social reformists in fact are trying to replace the authority of Marx with the authority of Kant

¹ Karl R. Popper, *Objektive Erkenntnis*, Hamburg, 1973, p. 95.

² *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie*, Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachf. GmbH, Berlin-Bad Godesberg, 1975, p. 3.

³ *Ibid.*

and Popper. It is pointed out in *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie* that the philosophy of Kant is still relevant today and the workers' (i. e. social-democratic) movement stands to become enriched from it.¹ This means that, in asserting the anti-authoritarianism of their teaching, the modern theoreticians of "democratic socialism" in fact resort to the same authority as they did in the early part of the twentieth century. For then the social reformists claimed that "the scientific force of socialism can only stand to gain by a return to Kant in its spiritual premises".² Devotion to Kant and his dogmas, which have been superseded and made obsolete by Marxism, remains a fixed factor in the ideology of social reformism as the authoritarian and dogmatic element of the concept of "democratic socialism".

In emphasizing the anti-dogmatism and anti-authoritarianism of "democratic socialism" its present-day adherents claim: "It is on this question that the cognitive teaching and political philosophy of critical rationalism meet. The political philosophy of critical rationalism supports democracy in an open society, insofar as there are just as few firm truths in politics as there are in science."³ Critical rationalism in politics, according to this view, means the readiness to listen to critical arguments and learn from experience on the basis of the Popper principle that "I may be wrong, you may be right, but together we may gain a sight of the truth."⁴

In demagogically asserting their readiness to listen to arguments and learn from experience as well as their recognition of the possibility of error, "democratic socialism" in fact rejects outright the critical arguments of Marxism despite the fact that they are supported by the real course of history.

It is not by pure chance that the denial of scientific truth and the interpretation of science as a whole not as a movement towards deeper and deeper truth but as a continual revelation of mistakes and errors form the philosophical basis of "democratic socialism".

This philosophic denial of scientific truth is essential to "democratic socialism", enabling it to reject outright scientific socialism and ensure that "democratic socialism" remains logically and permanently "open" to bourgeois and reformist theoretical

¹ *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie*, p. 2.

² Ludwig Woltmann, *Die Darwinsche Theorie und der Sozialismus*, Düsseldorf, 1899, p. 33.

³ *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie*, p. 16.

⁴ Karl R. Popper, *Die offene Gesellschaft und ihre Feinde*, Bern and Munich, 1970, p. 276.

innovations and at the same time permanently "closed" to Marxist teaching on socialism. The interpretation of science as a whole in the spirit of Kant, "avoiding error instead of making discovery"¹, is a necessary part of the philosophical grounding of "democratic socialism" as a barrier against the "errors" of scientific socialism in the countries of existing (and genuinely democratic) socialism. But such an interpretation turns out in reality to be a two-edged sword. It might be asked that if scientific progress is indeed the continual search for and elimination of error in hypotheses, then surely this interpretation itself and the whole philosophy of "democratic socialism" which rests on it are also totally erroneous and ought to be eliminated in the course of historical development and its scientific cognition. Quite clearly logical consistency requires that the critical-rationalist understanding of science should also apply to the theory of "democratic socialism". But this is a principle which the adherents of "democratic socialism" have no intention of following.

In borrowing the concepts of "anti-dogmatism" and "anti-authoritarianism" from Popper's critical rationalism, the "democratic socialists" have acquired a clever and convenient means of rejecting objective truths under the pretext of their obsolescence whenever they do not happen to suit their own views and political tastes. If indeed scientific progress is nothing more than the continual eradication of error, as the critical rationalists claim, then in principle nothing would remain from Marxism except error. Such is the logical (or, to be more precise, ideological) position held by the "democratic socialists" as a result of the critical-rationalist claim that, insofar as change and development are constantly taking place, nothing remains except error. Thus this concept completely ignores the fact that apart from the dying away of some aspects and relationships and the birth of new ones, both change and development imply that other aspects and relationships survive or remain stable, while others still are also modified. Capitalism, for example, has undoubtedly undergone considerable change and modification throughout the course of history, but at the same time it has not ceased to remain capitalism and as such it will stay until the socialist revolution is completely victorious. Furthermore, the Marxist-Leninist theory of social development remains objectively true in spite of all the changes

¹ Immanuel Kant, "Kritik der reinen Vernunft". In: *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, Hrsg. von der Preussischen Academie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1902, p. 517.

that have taken place in the world since it reflects the most basic and fundamental aspects of historical progress identified by Marx. But though Marxist-Leninist theory has elements of permanence (through its basic tenets), it is at the same time developing. It is both permanent and changing to the same extent that social reality is both permanent and changing.

In placing the total (in the theoretical and philosophical understanding of the term) "openness" of the concept of "democratic socialism" on the foundation of the critical rationalism of Kant and Popper, the "democratic socialists" try by means of the critical-rationalist "openness" to refute their main theoretical opponent, the materialist understanding of history. This cornerstone of Marxist philosophy and also the teaching of the historical inevitability of socialism which is based on it bear the brunt of the critical-rationalist attacks. What particularly appeals to the "democratic socialists" in Popper's philosophy is primarily his attempt to discredit the scientific truths established by Marx and the laws of natural history governing social development which he has revealed.

The ideologists of "democratic socialism" have "opened" their concept to the philosophy of Kant and Popper with the intention of "closing" it to the philosophy of historical materialism. According to the "democratic socialists" the historical materialist understanding of social development asserts the inevitability of socialism in the sense that it is something automatic and absolutely independent of human activity. They claim that this inevitability leaves no room for conscious activity by the people¹ and excludes freedom and democracy. Unable to understand the dialectics of freedom and necessity and metaphysically separating the one from the other, the "democratic socialists" conceive of socialism only as something ethical and desirable, while at the same time ascribing to historical materialism the claim that socialism is something that is completely automatic. By means of this rudimentary vulgarization of historical materialist understanding of socialism they try to discredit scientific socialism as being "deterministic", "lacking in freedom" and "anti-democratic". Thus, either socialism is desirable and therefore democratic or it is necessary and therefore undemocratic—such is the metaphysical alternative of the "democratic socialists" with which they try to confuse and

¹ Hans Josef Steinberg, *Sozialismus und deutsche Sozialdemokratie. Zur ideologie der Partei vor dem I. Weltkrieg*, Verlag für Literatur und Zeitgeschehen, Hannover, 1969, p. 97.

frighten people, whose understanding of the dialectics of freedom and necessity, and the desirable and the historically inevitable is weak.

The concept of "democratic socialism" ignores the objective laws of capitalist society which condition its inevitable transition to socialism. Thus, the scientific cognition of these objective laws and the possibilities for their utilization is quite superfluous to the "democratic socialists". They believe that social development is not susceptible to scientific cognition. "Human activity is directed by conscious and unconscious impulses and leads to a parallelogram of social forces, the preliminary resolution of which is scientifically impossible and quite impracticable in the foreseeable future."¹

At the head of his ideological demarcation of "democratic socialism" and scientific communism, Professor Ulrich Lohmar, a West German social-democratic ideologist, writes: "Social democracy has its origins in the moral values of freedom, justice and solidarity."² The implementation of these values ought to become a process "which demands volitional and moral energy of a kind that is relatively independent of an economic basis".³

Thus, as opposed to scientific socialism which relies upon a materialist concept of history, "democratic socialism" seeks the final causes of all social processes in human beings themselves and their ideas on freedom, justice and solidarity. This was very clearly shown by Rosa Luxemburg, who described "democratic socialism" as "a vain ideal, the force of whose conviction rests on the perfection it ascribes to itself".⁴

If we carefully analyze and compare the essential characteristics of "democratic socialism" as advanced by various social-democratic theoreticians, we discern primarily an avoidance of the fundamental questions—the influence exerted by the mode of production on the superstructure of society, the necessity for a radical transformation in relations of ownership over the means of production and the replacement of capitalist ownership by socialist social ownership, which is the only real basis for the solution of the

¹ Willi Eichler *Zur Einführung in den demokratischen Sozialismus*, Verlag Neue Gesellschaft GmbH, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1972, p. 107.

² Ulrich Lohmar, "Sozialdemokratie und Kommunismus". In: *Die Zeit*, Hamburg, April 21, 1972, p. 56.

³ Willy Brandt, *Friedrich Engels und die soziale Demokratie*, Verlag Neue Gesellschaft GmbH, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1970, p. 21.

⁴ Rosa Luxemburg, *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. 1, Erster Halbband, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1970, p. 377.

social problems facing mankind. Although in recent years a number of social-democratic theoreticians have tried to clarify the question of the theoretical sources of "democratic socialism", they all ignore these aspects of social science completely.

Economic theories of the origins of the concept of "democratic socialism" are not even mentioned. The relations of ownership and the relations of production which exert a decisive effect on the moral and cultural climate of society are not considered in connection with the basic ethical values of "democratic socialism". And therefore there is no version of "democratic socialism" that is internally and organically coherent. Insofar as there has been a consistent and conscious attempt to exclude from the theoretical sources of "democratic socialism" the only possible philosophy—the materialist understanding of history—that would provide internal coherence to the theory of social development, the so-called open character of the concept of "democratic socialism" inevitably makes it an eclectic doctrine.

The eclectic and low theoretical level of the philosophical basis of "democratic socialism" and the "open" character of its ideas result in it being far from a sound, scientifically based theory revealing the historical laws of social development. The liberal Social Democrats are evidently sufficiently conscious of the weakness of their philosophical position for they make no claim that their concept of "democratic socialism" should be regarded as a philosophy or a theory.¹

This vulnerability is recognized by the Social Democrats themselves, particularly those who belong to the left wing of the movement. Their gravitation to Marxism is not the least explained by their desire to rely on its scientific approach to the solution of the problems facing society today. These theoreticians are turning to some of the tenets of Marxism in their attempts to overcome the precariousness of the ideological foundations of their own doctrine, which has been built on the unstable soil of pluralism and "openness" to bourgeois reformist propositions and philosophical and ideological ideas.

But in stating that "democratic socialism" still maintains certain links with Marxism and is still "open" to certain of its tenets, it must be borne in mind that this connection and this "openness" are becoming increasingly formal in character. This formalism consists primarily in the fact that the "openness" is more and more

becoming selective and fragmentary. "Democratic socialism" is becoming more "open" only to certain of the tenets of Marxism and rejects Marxist teaching as a whole. But this kind of separation is not Marxism but subjectivist distortion. The liberal "democratic socialists", for example, select only those tenets which directly relate to the individual and to his free and all-round development. As a result they not only give Marxism an abstract-humanist character, but completely distort the essence of the whole philosophy. Willi Eichler, who rejects all the propositions of Marxism with the exception of those that relate directly to man and humanism, states for example: "Marxism was concerned with the freedom of the individual and not the substitution of the domination of one class for that of another."¹ Thus, we see how Marxism is borrowed with the express purpose of distorting it and how the doctrine of "democratic socialism" remains "open" to part of the teaching in order to reject the essence of its whole. Marx and Engels themselves in a letter to Bebel, Liebknecht and Bracke were quite clear on this point: "For almost forty years we have emphasised that class struggle is the immediate driving power of history, and in particular that the class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat is the great lever of the modern social revolution; we therefore, cannot possibly co-operate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement."²

The formal character of the "openness" of "democratic socialism" to Marxism also consists in the fact that the attitude of the "democratic socialists" (at least those on the right) towards Marxism is governed today not so much by a desire to utilize certain aspects of Marxist teaching as to try once again to demonstrate that Marxism is obsolete and to find new arguments in support of this hackneyed assertion. One of the latest of these attempts is the above-mentioned work by West German social-democratic right-wing theoreticians, entitled *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie*. An analysis of this work shows that its chief aim is to refute Marxism as a relevant and viable theory of social development. It is true that the work contains statements by Popper to the effect that a return to pre-Marxist sociology would be unthinkable and that Marx "opened our eyes

¹ Friedrich Brand, "Demokratischer Sozialismus ist keine Weltanschauung". In: *Die neue Gesellschaft*, No. 11, 1972, pp. 864-68.

¹ Willi Eichler, *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

² "Marx and Engels to August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Wilhelm Bracke and Others ('Circular Letter') in Leipzig (London, September 17-18, 1879)." In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 307.

and sharpened our perception of many problems"¹. But at the same time the dialectical method of social analysis is opened to doubt and the scientific value of the theoretical conclusions of *Capital* is called into question.

Finally the "democratic socialists" turn to Marxism only retrospectively. They completely ignore the contributions made to Marxism after Marx. For them there is no creative heritage of Marxism. The concept of "democratic socialism" is set firmly against creative Marxism and the achievements of its contemporary theoreticians and their practical embodiment in the socialist countries.

This is why the social reformists and the right and left revisionists join the anti-communists in making furious attacks on Marxist-Leninist teaching and socialism.

Many social reformist theoreticians not only make statements to the effect that Marxism is obsolete but also try to convince the workers' movement that Leninism is a purely Russian revolutionary phenomenon. They are unwilling to admit that Lenin's theoretical studies are not only based on the practical experience of revolutionary struggle in Russia, but on the achievements of science and on the historical experience of social development and liberation struggle throughout the world.

It is particularly necessary to stress the importance of Lenin's work on the practical implementation of the socialist transformation of society. It is true that he analyzed and generalized the experience of one country, Soviet Russia, since the rest of the world at the time was dominated by capitalism. But Lenin saw the general laws of socialist construction and formulated them as fundamental principles of revolutionary theory. And it is no exaggeration to say that these general principles on the building of socialism and the laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism are of international significance. Obviously, the experience of other countries which have entered the path to socialism has provided much new and instructive material for theoretical generalization. But these new developments do not alter the general laws as revealed by Lenin; they rather affirm, enrich and further define them.

Leninism is not bounded by the period of Lenin's lifetime. Marxism-Leninism is developed in the course of the theoretical work of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the fraternal parties and it is enriched with the experience and collective

thinking of the world communist movement. Despite all the accusations of "obsolescence" the great teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin lives on in the struggle for the triumph of socialism and communism.

The papers published at international conferences by representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the world reflect the result of collective theoretical thinking. These contain primarily a characterization of the present stage of historical development, its main motive forces and the prospects for the world revolutionary movement, an analysis of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and an elaboration of the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement, the problems facing the workers' and the national liberation movement, the means and forms of transition to socialism and the possibilities for avoiding a third world war and establishing lasting peace.

The experience of socialist construction in the USSR and the other socialist countries has helped the CPSU and the other fraternal parties to make a considerable theoretical contribution to revealing the fundamental laws and motive forces governing socialist society. They have developed and given concrete expression to Marxist-Leninist theory on the transition period from capitalism to socialism, on economic and cultural development within socialist society, on changes in the class structure and on ways of overcoming class differences, on the role of the working class and its party and on the socialist state and democracy under conditions of the building of socialism and communism.

The continuing creative development of Marxism-Leninism on an international scale shows that there can be no other theory in the world today capable of giving a comprehensive picture of social development and arming the working class with a thorough knowledge of the laws of the world revolutionary process and ways and means of conducting the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

4. The Aims and Purposes of "Democratic Socialism"

Realizing the tremendous importance that the formulation of aims has for the development of the working-class movement, the "democratic socialists" try to take issue with scientific socialism and its embodiment in the process of socialist construction in the USSR and the other socialist countries over just this question of ultimate aims and purposes. By setting such aims as suit themselves, they try to lead the working-class movement away from

¹ *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie*, p. 7.

the true path to socialism and direct it not towards the liquidation but rather towards the maintenance and even strengthening of the present capitalist system. Furthermore, the adherents of "democratic socialism" do not shrink from clothing their anti-socialist purposes in socialist phraseology. It is therefore far from being always easy to see the bourgeois apologia and anti-working-class ideology hidden behind this socialist phraseology.

So what actually are the aims of the theory and practice of "democratic socialism"? Despite the name, which might give the impression that its ultimate aim was the building of socialism, neither the theoreticians nor the politicians of social reformism have this end in view. It is significant that even the word "building" or "construction" as applied to socialism is totally absent in the political lexicon of social reformism. But then this is hardly surprising. The building of socialism implies the destruction of capitalism, yet it remains the firm conviction of the "democratic socialists" that capitalism should not be overthrown, but on the contrary strengthened and that socialism, far from being the negation of capitalism, is in fact its affirmation only in a renewed and reformist guise. This conviction, which may possibly be unconscious and is certainly unexpressed, amounts to an absolute truth¹ in the theory and practice of "democratic socialists". They make no attempt whatsoever to transcend capitalism and objectively stand rooted in the soil of capitalist society. This is expressed in the well-known social-democratic thesis according to which socialism is not an end in itself but a permanently unattainable goal which can only be strived for. But it is precisely the *elimination of capitalism and the building of socialism as a practicable and feasible aim that constitute the fundamental criteria by which the revolutionary workers' movement differs from the forces of bourgeois democracy*. To forget this is to forget socialism.

In the early fifties the "democratic socialists" declared that socialization of property was not essential to the creation of a socialist society. Instead they declared that the most important constituent of socialism was the "moral ideal" and "the freedom of the individual". But this lack of an economic foundation for "democratic socialism" was not felt for long. It soon became inundated with the ideas of a so-called mixed economy. In the ma-

¹ Although the "democratic socialists" reject "absolute truth" as a philosophical category, they virtually look upon their own ultimate aims as "absolute truths".

jority of programmes of socialist and social-democratic parties private ownership of the means of production was declared a "legal factor" in socialist society. True, planning was retained as a last fragment of the old reformism, but insofar as socialization of property was no longer considered an essential condition of socialism, the social-democratic concept of planning basically amounted to state-monopoly control.

The renunciation of socialist aims by many of the right-wing leaders has naturally been accompanied by the gradual discarding of all political means outside the framework of bourgeois democracy. The class struggle has been declared obsolete; the entrepreneur, who constitutes the object of this struggle, has disappeared, and his place being taken by the anonymous shareholder. The worker only confronts the "management", which is supposed to have no interest in his exploitation. According to these modern theories, all those who once belonged to different classes are now ready, as a result of being able to air their views at various levels of the "democratic process" (i. e., in local government, parliament, etc.), to seek agreed solutions and thereby work out for themselves "socialist forms of living together".

Many of the social reformist theoreticians openly propagate the idea that "democratic socialism" needs no clear-cut orientation or strict formulation of its ultimate aims.

In an article entitled 'Democratic Socialism Is Not an 'End Goal' But a Task', the West German Social Democrat, Peter Reuschenbach, stated clearly that "the proponents of democratic socialism ... are not striving for any new social system as an ultimate aim, and, furthermore, they have no ultimate aim".¹

A number of "democratic socialist" theoreticians have tried to give a "scientific grounding" to this view. "Insofar as social development is a continuous process", declared Karl Czernetz of Austria, prominent in the Socialist International, "it is methodologically incorrect to speak of socialism as an end in itself."²

Thus socialism, according to the "democratic socialist" theoreticians, cannot be represented as the ultimate goal. Why? Because the goal of the theory and practice of "democratic

¹ Peter Reuschenbach, "Demokratischer Sozialismus—Kein 'Endziel', sondern Aufgabe". In: *Die neue Gesellschaft*, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, No. 5, 1973, p. 361.

² Karl Czernetz, "Überlegungen zur Strategie des Sozialismus". In: *Die Zukunft*, Vienna, No. 3, 1972, p. 1.

socialism" cannot, according to the social reformists, be achieved as the result of a single leap. It is a continuous process and is constantly changing. It develops as society develops, continually renewing itself. Therefore "democratic socialism" can include no teaching on the ultimate goal of the workers' movement. It can only be an endless discussion on the aims and means of that movement.

The purpose of this negation of socialism as the ultimate aim of the workers' movement is quite clear. It is intended to oppose existing socialism as the embodiment of the theory of scientific socialism worked out by Marx, Engels and Lenin. The "democratic socialists" try to present existing socialism as simply the result of a single leap, as something that has ossified through its adherence to an unchanging ultimate aim—the building of a communist society not as a subjective desirability but as an objective and historical necessity.

In rejecting socialism as an ultimate aim (and in point of fact rejecting socialism entirely) the "democratic socialists" claim that Marxism has consigned to oblivion the constructive tasks of changing society upon which "democratic socialism" has supposedly concentrated without having any ultimate aim for the socialist movement. In fact, of course, existing socialism as the embodiment of a genuinely Marxist teaching on socialism has solved the practical tasks of transforming society through its clear, historically detined and scientifically grounded plan of action, its precise historical perspective on socialist construction and its scientifically tried and tested orientation for the working-class movement. But the "democratic socialists" insist on the necessity of changing society without any long-term, ultimate objectives. Ultimate aims are discarded in favour of permanent change. Thus aggravated by such "democratic socialist" doctrines as "pluralism" and "openness", which inevitably lead to unprincipled eclecticism, the "democratic socialist" movement becomes blind and historically indeterminate. The fruitlessness of such ideology and politics, its "historical hopelessness", so to speak, is now being recognized even among the "democratic socialists" themselves, especially those on the left.¹

¹ Frode Møller Nicolaisen, "Først analysen—så strategien". In: *Ny politik*, No. 9, 1975, p. 10; Josef Hindels, *Was ist heute links? Sozialistische Strategie im Spätkapitalismus*, Europa Verlag, Vienna, Frankfurt, Zürich, 1970, p. 108; Giovanni Pieraccini, "Repensare il socialismo". In: *Ulysse*, Florence, Vol. XI, No. 70, 1971, p. 157; Eric S. Heffer, "Labour's Future". In: *The Political Quarterly*, London, Vol. 43, No. 4, 1972, p. 381.

Many are now beginning to understand the futility of the path they chosen, which has no ultimate aim in view and is not directed to the social reconstruction of society and they are trying to overcome this by settling on an ultimate goal for the social-democratic movement. But in doing so they are adopting positions that are fundamentally incompatible with the essence of social democracy as a political movement, for which it is the "movement that counts, not the goal". Because in practice it turns out that the ultimate aim does indeed count and is of utmost importance for the movement, constituting as it does its principal *raison d'être*. For without an ultimate aim the movement itself becomes nothing.

Current events have shown what results from any movement that flies the flag of "democratic socialism". Experience has shown that the regression of "democratic socialism" and its insignificance as a movement (which has virtually nothing in common with socialism) are largely due to the very fact that the movement has no ultimate aim. A "socialist" movement, which discounted the building of socialism as the ultimate goal, virtually determined thereby its own aim (of petty reforms and continual improvements of the capitalist system). This in turn negated the movement as socialist and made it instead a movement for the improvement of capitalism which led the working class away from socialism.

Thus F. M. Nicolaisen, a representative of the Union of Social Democratic Youth of Denmark, gives the following characteristic of the mistakes made by the Social Democrats: "We made a choice in favour of the easy and the current and as a result of this the more difficult problems were laid aside. But insofar as the current problems of the sick society kept on growing and this society remained essentially unchanged, the party was not merely oriented on compromises but in time made them an end in itself."¹ Neglect of the long-term fundamental tasks facing the socialist movement and the "democratic socialist" emphasis on immediate problems have led the workers' movement away from socialism. As Nicolaisen noted, the failure to draw up long-term tasks during more favourable times resulted in the people losing their sense of solidarity and social problems were solved by means of a simple redistribution of values among the different groups of wage workers which barely affected the traditional class differences. This policy of the Social Democrats was therefore answered by a growing movement of those who refused to pay their taxes; as a result of the lack of an integral approach small problems were

¹ Frode Møller Nicolaisen, *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

fanned into major ones, which in turn led to the social-democratic movement "being deprived of its former unity".¹

But it is necessary to add to these conclusions that the rejection of socialism as the ultimate aim of the social-democratic movement inevitably leads not only to the loss of unity in that movement, but to the complete loss of its socialist character. There can be no movement in human society that does not have an aim and to state that it is the "movement that counts, not the goal" does not mean to renounce the ultimate aims of a political movement. It is simply a slogan which to all intents and purposes replaces one aim with another. What it means for the social-democratic movement is the renunciation of socialism as the ultimate aim of the working-class movement and the preservation of the capitalist system by means of its improvement which is set as an ultimate aim in its stead.

The proponents of "democratic socialism" are only too aware of the impossibility of existence without purpose. So consciously or unconsciously they have to provide the working man with aims that will distract him from the real revolutionary transformation of capitalism into socialism. They understand perfectly that the rejection of socialism as an ultimate aim is an essential characteristic of "democratic socialism", which is basically petty reformism. Therefore, they continuously renew their attacks against the concept of socialism as the historically defined goal of the workers' movement. Thus, the authors of *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie* try to present arguments in favour of improving "the present" (for which read the capitalist system) as the chief goal of the "democratic socialist" movement. "It is only natural," they write, "that man needs aims and ideals, and should have an idea of a 'better society'. But his efforts should be directed towards improving the present, that is to say eradicating the causes of evil in the world and fighting poverty, disease, oppression and exploitation in any form. Furthermore, it is easier to reach agreement on combatting specific shortcomings in society than on striving towards abstract visions of the future."²

Although this document proclaims the elimination of exploitation, it presumes to achieve this without a transition from capitalism to socialism but by means of improving the present on the basis of agreement.

Thus, it is once again recognized (and now on the theoretical level) that "democratic socialism" selects as the goals of the working-

¹ Frode Møller Nicolaisen, *Op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.

² *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie*, p. 40.

class movement those objectives where it is easier to reach agreement and which are easier to accomplish. Fear and retreat in the face of difficulties are what characterize the goals of the "democratic socialists". Easy solutions are what the "democratic socialists" look for in choosing the aims of their movement. This must be stressed. The "democratic socialists" are not concerned with what is important for the real achievement of socialism or with developing an historical and scientifically grounded approach to analyzing the real processes of social development in a given country or in the world as a whole.

"Democratic socialism" does not try to overcome the difficulties on the path to socialism, but rather uses them to justify its own departure from socialism. The difficulties involved in the transition from capitalism into socialism are made into insurmountable obstacles and used to justify the setting of petty targets which are designed to improve rather than eradicate capitalism. Improving the present is all that the "democratic socialists" will dare to offer as the aims of their movement.

The concept of socialism as an ultimate historically defined aim is unacceptable to the "democratic socialists" primarily because they regard existing socialism as the fulfilment of, to use their expression, an "ultimate utopian goal". They then try to intimidate the working-class and democratic movement with what they consider to be the inseparable connections between an "ultimate utopian goal" and oppression and anti-democratism. Take this characteristic example from the above-mentioned work (*Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie*) of such intimidation, intended to alarm the petty bourgeoisie.

"Utopian goals and oppression are ultimately linked one with another. The end justifies all means adopted for overcoming the obstacles on the path to its achievement. Since the utopian plan can only be carried out if social goals on the long road to its implementation do not change, it is essential to crush all deviation and change capable of damaging the utopian design. The unbearable suffering and sacrifice, which society is forced to undergo, pale into insignificance when compared with the promise of the 'final goal'. Utopian or chiliastic social technology by which 'society' as a whole should be 'transformed according to a fixed general plan' implies omniscience as well as omnipotence, with the former ruling out open criticism and excluding the possibility of mistakes."¹

¹ *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie*, pp. 40-41.

Thus, the critical rationalists without any kind of scientific argumentation and relying on nothing but ideological prejudice and subjectivism try to discredit socialism as the ultimate goal of the working-class movement. The very idea of an ultimate aim in the socialist movement they try to discredit by saying that it is inseparably linked with oppression. They try to show that acceptance of an ultimate aim in the struggle for socialism means the acceptance of permanently defined goals for the socialist movement which remain unchanged for a long historical period. This, of course, is nothing more than an attempt to vulgarize the ultimate goals of scientific socialism and its real historical embodiment in the socialist countries and present the ultimate goals of scientific socialism as the only goals of socialist construction. The real situation, of course, is that scientific socialism includes the formulation not only of the ultimate, strategic and long-term goals of the socialist reconstruction of the world, but also immediate, tactical targets as dictated by the requirements of society not during the whole period of socialist construction but at individual concrete stages. Besides the ultimate goals, which in the end amount to the building of communism, scientific socialism consistently sets the practical tasks of socialist construction in conformity with the relevant situation during the various stages on the road to communism. "Democratic socialists" say nothing about this, for it is their intention to falsify the ultimate goals of scientific socialism and its differentiated approach to the setting of ultimate and intermediate goals. They are also silent about the fact that the aims of scientific socialism are formulated on the basis of a dialectics of ultimate and intermediate aims in which emphasis is given to the ultimate aims, that is, the perspective of the movement. This means that the intermediate aims are formulated by socialist society on the basis of its real achievements and in such a way as not to depart from the general prospects for socialist construction in order to promote rather than impede the achievement of the ultimate goal of socialist construction.

When the "democratic socialists" arbitrarily distort the aims and purposes of scientific socialism reducing them to nothing more than the ultimate aims of socialist construction and then when they accuse the Communists of devotion to ultimate goals, what they are, in fact, doing is criticizing the Marxist-Leninist sense of purpose and their concentration on the main issue within the varied and highly complex process of the socialist reconstruction of the world. They criticize Marxists-Leninists for never losing the perspective of the working-class movement and seeing it in every

historical situation. They try to discredit Marxists-Leninists for knowing what they want and knowing how to achieve what they want and what is historically necessary, for not losing sight of their fundamental goals amid the tasks and difficulties of the moment, and for overcoming these difficulties and holding on to those most important elements without which the building of socialism as a genuinely humanistic and democratic society would be unthinkable. They try to cast aspersions on Marxists-Leninists for not balking at the difficulties facing the socialist reconstruction of the world and not seeking easy paths to socialism but holding to the only real and historically determined roads to socialism.

In conclusion then, the aims and purposes of "democratic socialism" are so formulated that both the theory and practice are directed, first, against scientific socialism and its embodiment in the socialist countries, and, second, towards the maintenance of the capitalist system. Theoretically this means the rejection of socialism as an ultimate historically determined aim, an abandonment of the solution of the fundamental problems of socialist transformation and the complete subordination of the aims and purposes of "democratic socialism" to reformist means of achieving them. The essential characteristic of the "democratic socialist" movement is petty reformism and it is this that determines the aims and purposes of the movement not the reverse. It is not, as it ought to be in a proper correlation between ends and means, the aims of the socialist transformation of society that determine the choice of the appropriate means for effecting this transformation and the concrete, historically intermediate tasks that have to be fulfilled on the road to socialism. The fact that the aims of the workers' movement are, in the concept of "democratic socialism", subordinated to the means by which this movement is maintained, reduces the latter to naught, because such subordination causes the working-class movement to lose its socialist character. This feature of "democratic socialism" is clearly shown in virtual transformation of reformist "socialism" into capitalist apologia.

5. "Democratic Socialist" Reformism—a Means of Adjusting to Capitalism

Although the various factions among the "democratic socialists" dispute the aims and purposes of the movement and the necessity to articulate its long-term prospects or set out a more precise definition of its strategy, both the left and the right agree upon one

thing: the goals of "democratic socialism" can only be achieved by reformism, for this is what they consider "democratic". The "democratic socialist" movement has thus chosen its means in advance and the aims of the movement ought to correspond to these means. Anything that cannot be achieved by reform and by an abstractly conceived democratization of society, must be eliminated from the aims and purposes of "democratic socialism". But, of course, all that can be achieved by means of the abstract democratization and peaceful transformation of capitalism is the latter's modification within the capitalist framework. This means that "democratic socialist" reformism is nothing else than a departure from genuinely socialist transformation and an interpretation of capitalism as a society in which changes in part have to be made for the sake of the preservation of the whole. "Democratic socialist" reformism can only be an apologia, direct or indirect, overt or covert, for the capitalist system. And even when the "democratic socialists" permit themselves to criticize capitalism, this criticism in point of fact amounts to nothing more than empty phraseology designed to conceal its adaptation to the bourgeois system.

The inevitability of this characteristic of "democratic socialist" reformism is conditioned by the fact that the "democratic socialists" attach to this form of social change, which has quite definite limitations imposed upon it, a significance that is made absolute and unlimited in scope, while either rejecting outright the only historically inevitable means of social transformation—the social revolution—or watering it down with reforms. Marxists, on the other hand, while insisting on the determining role of social revolution in effecting radical social change, do not nevertheless reject reform completely, believing that it is necessary to draw a clear distinction between what in a given historical situation is achievable by means of reform and what may be achieved only by social revolution. The essence of the Marxist understanding of the dialectics of these methods of social transformation was expressed by Lenin as follows: "The concept 'reform' is undoubtedly the opposite of the concept 'revolution'. Failure to remember this contrast, failure to remember the line that divides these two concepts, constantly leads to very serious mistakes in all historical discussions. But this contrast is not something absolute, this line is not something dead, but alive and changing, and one must be able to define it in each particular case."¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Apropos of an Anniversary", *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, 1968, pp. 115-16.

It is on this understanding of the dialectics of revolution and reform that the Marxist historical approach to the solution of the problems of correlation between reform and revolution is based. The essential feature of this approach consists primarily in the recognition that reforms do not and cannot exclude revolution, upon which, in the final analysis, every genuinely workers' party must orientate itself. Furthermore, it consists in the recognition of the fact that reforms cannot and must not be made against the revolution, but rather as steps on the road towards it. The criterion of such a reform is whether it expresses the interests of the working class and the exploited masses or those of the dominant classes and the exploiting minority. All this means that Marxism is alien both to anarchic rejection of reforms and revisionist, particularly "democratic socialist" absolutization of their significance. Of fundamental importance for Marxists is the concrete historical approach to reforms, which is characterized by a combination of the struggle for reform and the efforts to develop the revolutionary process.

A point of some interest is that the concept of "democratic change" is interpreted by the two main trends in "democratic socialism" differently. This difference of approach has created constant tension in the social-democratic and socialist parties and has frequently led to splits in their ranks and the break-away of the more radical groups, not to mention the acrimonious disputes that have taken place within the parties themselves on this question.

The essence of the dispute lies in the different understanding of the possibility and necessity for reformist change, that is, change that does not alter the essence of the capitalist social system.

Following in the steps of Bernstein the social-democratic liberals believe in the possibility of changing the capitalist system by gradual, evolutionary means. This idea has been clearly expressed by Herbert Wehner, a prominent member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. In an interview with *Die neue Gesellschaft*, the theoretical organ of the SDPG, he said: "Recently I was asked whether social democracy had abandoned its intention to overthrow capitalism. I replied that it certainly had, for capitalism is not something that can be overthrown. Rather we have to concern ourselves with changing it."¹

According to the right Social Democrats capitalism has

¹ "Auf dem Weg zur sozialen Demokratie! Gespräch mit Herbert Wehner". In: *Die neue Gesellschaft*, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, No. 1, 1971, p. 4.

transformed itself to such an extent over the last few decades, that the traditional descriptions of it are no longer applicable and there is no longer any need to overthrow it. "We live," writes Helmut Schmidt, "in a multiclass society, in a pluralist society, where between the various classes and social groups there are tensions and contradictions of various importance and intensity. To characterize our economic system as 'late capitalist' does little to explain the essence of the phenomenon. In fact it is a mixed economic and social system in which three forces oppose and influence each other—state legislation and administration, the decentralized and in part contradictory decisions of individual economic agents and, lastly, the various unions and cartels."¹

But this kind of statement simply avoids the main characteristic of the capitalist system today—the dominance of monopoly capital which exerts a direct and indirect influence on various aspects of capitalist society. Despite all the complex and differentiating processes taking place within capitalist society the monopoly circles have not yielded any of their positions. Extreme property inequality is as prevalent as it ever was and in certain respects may even be said to be on the increase, a fact which is recognized by the Social Democrats themselves, particularly those on the left. The clearly apologetic character of the right reformist approach to capitalism has given rise to harsh objections from the left Social Democrats and Socialists and sometimes even from the moderate Social Democrats. They are correct in their assertion that the social contradictions and contrasts in "late capitalist society" are even more aggravated and that new additional phenomena have occurred which show that capitalism is more and more becoming an obstacle on the road to social progress. In more recent times as a result of the negative consequences of the general crisis of capitalism, these conclusions are beginning to be shared by an increasing number of middle-of-the-road Social Democrats.

The aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism in the early seventies forced the Social Democrats to question much in the capitalist system, including the private capitalist market mechanism.

According to Bruno Kreisky, "We are now in the initial phase of the rebirth of planned economic thinking."² Olof Palme draws the

conclusion that "market forces need to be regulated"¹ and that "state planning ought to be introduced in those spheres where partial direct participation by the state is necessary."²

But the suggested solution (partial restructuring of the economy, strengthening the mechanism of planning and regulating, and control of those capital investments which are important to the economy as a whole) do not go beyond the framework of state control, which has now been adopted by all capitalist countries irrespective of which party is in power.

But for all their criticism of capitalist society, the bourgeois liberal Social Democrats still cannot bring themselves to face the question of the economic position of the monopoly capital, let alone of a system which is based on private ownership, competition and exploitation of the working people. The liberal Social Democrats while recognizing the negative phenomena engendered by private ownership of the means of production, still claim that the most important issue is economic control. In their opinion, public ownership can only be implemented to the extent that it does not disturb the effectiveness of the market economy which in their opinion is the most efficient of all presently operating economic mechanisms.

The right Social Democrats try to defend their position with references to the growing role of the state which is more and more functioning as an economic regulator, to the growth of the public sector (the draft Long-Term Programme of the SDPG envisaged an increase in the share of the public sector to 34 per cent of the gross national product by 1985) and to the division of functions observed in the developed capitalist countries between ownership and management. At the SDPG Congress in Hannover (1973) Willy Brandt gave a detailed analysis of this question. He referred to the Godesberg Programme, which pointed out that socialization alone would not automatically bring greater freedom and drew up a list of measures designed to control the economy (control over capital investments, expansion of planning and coordination of all important private deals, limitation of the influence of economic interests on political decisions, etc.). Brandt came to the conclusion that "the market is controllable" and therefore conditions in the FRG "can be gradually changed with the help of political power"³

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

² *Ibid.*, p. 80.

³ *Parteitag der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands, Vom 10. bis 14. April 1973, Hannover. Band 1. Protokoll der Verhandlungen*, Hrsg. Vorstand der SPD, Bonn, 1974, p. 98.

¹ Helmut Schmidt, *Auf dem Fundament des Godesberger Programms*, Verlag Neue Gesellschaft GmbH, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1973, pp. 21–22.

² W. Brandt, B. Kreisky, O. Palme, *Briefe und Gespräche*, Europäische Verlagsanstalt, Frankfurt—Köln, 1975, p. 83.

Carl Landauer, one of the oldest social-democratic theoreticians and the author of a number of studies of public ownership of the means of production, has investigated these problems for many years. He claims that practical experience has not shown the superiority of socialization as an economic mechanism and that the only solution is to have workers participate in securing a "more just distribution of profits".¹

Landauer's statements are not only in contradiction to the true situation in the socialist countries, where on the basis of public ownership of the means of production the economy has been completely transformed and regenerated over a comparatively short historical period with the result that the living standards of the population have risen sharply. He also virtually ignores the experience in nationalisation in various branches of industry in the capitalist countries which demonstrates the increasing effectiveness of enterprises in the public sector.

Landauer and the liberal Social Democrats are criticized by the Socialists and left Social Democrats. These latter are increasingly coming to realize the necessity of public ownership of key branches of the economy. The "Young Socialists" in the left wing of the Labour Party in Britain, Italian and French Socialists, and Socialists and Social Democrats all over the world are now beginning to demand socialization of the means of production.

But at the same time there are important differences between these various supporters of public ownership of the means of production which are worth noting in the process of determining their overall ideas on the "concept of democratic socialism".

One of the approaches to this problem has been formulated by Karl Czernetz. The socialist model of society, he believes, envisages a type of mixed economy, in which the most important means of production will be owned publicly but at the same time small and medium-sized private agricultural, industrial and commercial enterprises will continue to exist probably for a lengthy period of time. "The three elements of the socialist model," writes Czernetz, "are a socialized economy, planning and democracy which are an inseparable, integral whole."²

The "French model of socialism", which was outlined by François Mitterrand in his book *Un socialisme du possible*, also

¹ Carl Landauer, *Die Sozialdemokratie*, Verlag Weltarchiv GmbH, Hamburg, 1972, p. 59.

² Karl Czernetz, "Überlegungen zur Strategie des Sozialismus". In: *Die Zukunft*, Vienna, No. 3, 1972, p. 4.

envisages a "mixed economy" in which "for a number of years socialist power will have to preserve a significant private sector side-by-side with the socialist".¹ This implies a phased process of nationalization over a relatively long period.²

Demands for changes in the capitalist economy directly hinge on the question of power. What is meant by the state in capitalist society today? Whose interests does it reflect? Does it need simply improvement or radical transformation? These questions are at the focus of attention in social-democratic literature devoted to the concept of "democratic socialism".

According to the liberal Social Democrats democracy has been extended to increasingly wider sections of the population in proportion to the changes in the social structure of society, the strengthening of the social-democratic movement and a number of other factors. This made the Social Democrats reject the Marxist idea of doing away with the bourgeois state and set themselves the task of giving existing democracy and society the widest possible social colouring. The concept of a new socialist society was replaced by the concept of a social democracy. Henceforth socialism for the liberal Social Democrats had been transformed into the permanent reform of society.³ Henceforth the main concern of the "democratic socialists" was the preservation, not the transformation of bourgeois democracy.

"We shall watch very closely whether the foundations of our democracy are questioned," said Willy Brandt, "and if so, by whom and in what way the basis of our democracy shall be questioned. We shall not stand for cynical criticism from the so-called formal democracy, since this is only a means to the justification of dubious, anti-democratic aims.... The enemies of parliamentary, free democracy are the enemies of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and we disassociate ourselves from them."⁴

To justify their defence of bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois parliamentary system, the "democratic socialists" advance a thesis to the effect that the modern capitalist state, inasmuch as it fulfils numerous functions in the life of society, has

¹ François Mitterrand, *Un socialisme du possible*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1970, pp. 55, 57.

² *Ibid.*, p. 59.

³ Günter Bartsch, "Totalitärer, marxistischer oder demokratischer Sozialismus?" In: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Bonn, No. 28, 1966, p. 20.

⁴ Willy Brandt, "Politik in Deutschland—Weltvorstellungen unter Ideologie verdacht". In: *Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung*, Bonn, No. 102/S. 1017, 1973, p. 1022.

ceased to be an instrument for the political domination of the capitalist classes, but at the same time cannot be considered a means for regulating all aspects of the life of society or exercising complete control over the capitalist economy. According to this concept the social nature of production is not determined by the type of property, but by the content and character of the functions performed. The activity of a private enterprise may be socialized (that is, subordinated to the interest of society above all) by "democratic control" through a system of governmental regulation and economic programming.

One such means is believed by the Social Democrats to be the workers' demand for the extension of democracy to all spheres of capitalist society, particularly to production.

The point is that the imperfections of parliamentary democracy in modern capitalist society are so apparent that they cannot be denied even by the liberal "democratic socialists". Willi Eichler wrote on the subject of capitalist society: "Relations of dependence have not been eradicated even now. Anonymous control over economic and spiritual instruments of power and domination over production and distribution by concerns, cartels, syndicates, and other amalgamations that restrict freedom and competition; the concentration of power in the "culture industry"—all this shows that access to true freedom and equality is still being blocked."¹

One means to the elimination of these shortcomings and the improvement of "social democracy" is seen by the liberal social democrats to lie in the development of participation in the decision-making process. Worker participation is considered as an historical task, the implementation of which will give democracy a whole new perspective. Worker participation is seen as part of the market economy system which has been strengthened as a result of the introduction of various incentives (profit sharing, co-ownership of capital increment, various workers' funds, etc.). Those who propagate participation hasten to calm the bourgeoisie by stressing that it holds no threats for the capitalist system. Participation is not directed at the alienation of property—it only implies the introduction in management of workers alongside the capitalist. The workers must continually realize that raising the level of their participation in the affairs of the enterprise simultaneously raises their share of responsibility. It is clear that such a demand makes worker participation into a factor stabilizing the capitalist

enterprise. From "democratization" of this sort only the capitalists stand to gain.

Until quite recently parliamentary democracy in combination with worker participation seemed to the bourgeois liberal Social Democrats the optimum solution to the problem of how to operate the mechanism of political democracy. But the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism forced the Social Democrats into making a number of admissions about the nature of this type of "democracy". "Parliamentarism in Europe," declared Olof Palme, "is going through a state of chaos at the present moment. From various sides alarm has been expressed that things do not look good for the future of democracy."¹ Bruno Kreisky pointed to the new types of confrontation taking place within the capitalist state today, while Brandt in his turn wrote: "I am particularly alarmed at the state of the democratic parliamentary system in the majority of West European countries which is showing signs of confusion and disorder."² In another part of the correspondence he states: "We must assume that our state will in the future be subject to conflicts between the needs of society as a whole and the irresponsible claims of individual groups in key positions and powerful organizations. We must protect our democratic state from the dictatorship of this kind of groups."³

"This kind of groups" means above all the monopoly capitalists, who have been somewhat evasively treated by the social-democratic leaders.

The theoretical works that take their cue from Marxism as conceived by Social Democrats do tend to call a spade a spade. The Young Socialists in the FRG, for instance, point to the obvious dependence of the governments in the capitalist countries on the large national and multinational concerns. In Austria the left note in their programme document, entitled "For Socialist Politics of the SPA", that the main function of the capitalist state is to regulate a market based on profit. Jean-Pierre Chevènement, one of the leaders of the French left-wing Socialists, declared that the state was not "an empty carcass, but a decisive factor in the organization of the capitalist system at the contemporary stage of its development and therefore a frontline post in the class struggle".⁴

¹ W. Brandt, B. Kreisky, O. Palme, *Op. cit.*, p. 90.

² *Ibid.*, p. 76.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

⁴ Jean-Pierre Chevènement, *Le vieux, la crise, le neuf*. Flammarion, Paris, 1974, p. 220.

¹ Willi Eichler, *Op. cit.*, pp. 45-46.

Finnish left Socialists write that the class character of the state is once again acquiring relevance in social-democratic circles. Events have shown that increasing the role of the state in the economy does not change the capitalist mode of production. The programme document of the Belgian Socialists declares: "The Socialist Party is not called upon to manage the capitalist system. Its participation in government depends on the possibility of defending the interests of the working people by gradually implementing the structural reforms which it fights for."¹

What should the capitalist state be replaced by? The majority of theoretical works by the Socialists suggest as an alternative a form of self-governing socialism. According to the programme of the Belgian Socialists, this type of socialism is understood as a principle applicable to all aspects of society. "Social democracy ought to guarantee each individual direct and broad access to decision-making on the various problems that affect him. Socialist society guarantees maximum decentralization and autonomy."²

Certain Social Democrats of this type, however, are somewhat more careful in their evaluation of the prospects for "self-governing socialism". François Mitterrand, for example, wrote: "Self-government has not yet found the kind of structure required to make it a reality."³

Many Socialists are of the opinion that a policy of transforming the capitalist state into a self-governing socialist state is in direct contradiction to improving bourgeois parliamentary democracy by the institution of "participation".

In recent years social-democratic literature has come up with a number of definitions classifying the different types of reform. Such terms as "system-changing", "system-improving", "system-stabilizing" reforms, "system-transcending" reforms and even "system-exploding" reforms have been coined. These descriptions conceal a heated ideological polemic, which has engulfed all trends in the social-democratic movement and which centres around the question of whether social democracy is to remain a reformist adjunct to capitalism or whether it is to adopt a more radical approach to the solution of social problems. Over this question, as over others, a definite polarization of views within the social-democratic movement can be traced.

¹ *Le peuple*, November 19, 1974.

² *Ibid.*

³ François Mitterrand, *L'homme. Les idées*, Flammarion, Paris, 1974, p. 108.

That social democracy has been pursuing a policy of futile reformism is recognized by the Social Democrats themselves. Thus the Danish left Social Democrat K. Madsen in an article to mark his party's centenary wrote: "Over the past hundred years the party has emphasized the need to put right the numerous shortcomings in the capitalist system. To a certain extent it has succeeded in this. But it is hard to look back on a past which to a certain extent has been characterized by more or less successful compromises with the bourgeois parties. One after another we have gone back on our basic principles just so as to be able to boast that we have exerted an influence on decision-making."¹ This evaluation, which speaks for itself, would be true of many member parties of the Socialist International.

But the latest theoretical works of social democracy point to the reformist path as the only possible one for achieving the aims of "democratic socialism". According to the new Swedish social-democratic programme, for example, experience has confirmed the social-democratic conviction that the transformation of society on the basis of "democratic socialism" is the only possible path for achieving freedom.... This path may be long and difficult, but it has the decided advantage of bringing about transformation with active participation of all members of society.²

Those Social Democrats whose policies are orientated upon maintaining parliamentary democracy and the bourgeois state, look upon reforms as "system-changing". The Danish Social Democrat, Per Hoekkerup,³ suggests that many small reforms taken together constitute a revolution that is far more stable than that in the countries where major revolutionary leaps have taken place. Brandt, however, sees this division of reforms into those which "improve" and those which "transcend" the system as being arbitrary. He holds that every reform contains an element of change.⁴ Kreisky too sees no difference between "system-stabilizing" and "system-changing" reforms. In his opinion this question has to be answered dialectically: numerous reforms eventually lead to qualitative change.⁵

¹ K. Madsen, "Tankeri anledning af et jubilæum". In: *Ny politik*, No. 6, 1971, p. 12.

² Forslag till nylt partiprogramm". In: *Aktuellt i politikien*, No. 13, 1971, pp. 13-23.

³ Per Hoekkerup, "Socialdemokratie—et praktisk parti". In: *Ny politik*, No. 6, 1971, pp. 14-15.

⁴ W. Brandt, B. Kreisky, O. Palme, *Op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

But in his correspondence with Kreisky and Palme, Brandt nevertheless admitted that the possibilities for political reform by the West German coalition government, which comprised Social Democrats and Liberals, had been highly overrated in view of the stubborn resistance from various lobbies.¹ In this case Brandt was primarily referring to the monopolies.

The left parties and groups look somewhat differently upon reforms. According to Mitterrand, reforms are revolutionary if they envisage a complete break with the established political order, with capitalist society. "The daily struggle," he writes, "for decisive reform of the social structure can be revolutionary in character."² The party must, he believes, utilize all forms of struggle (both in parliament and on the shop floor) so as to determine the opponent's weak spots and deliver the main thrust at them. But this thrust is not conceived of in terms of a single action, but rather as continuously applied pressure.

This position is also held by the Belgian Socialists. In their programme they emphasize that socialism demands the implementation of deep structural reforms in all spheres. "Socialism," they state, "is fighting for the complete transformation of society and this struggle expresses its revolutionary will."³

Radical change in the foundations of the present system via reform is also the objective of the left wing of the Labour Party in Britain.⁴

For a number of years now the Young Socialists in the Social Democratic Party of Germany have been developing a "two-fold strategy" of social reform. This strategy envisages utilizing parliament and the party for the carrying out of "democratic socialist" policies while at the same time invigorating the "base", meaning those involved in production and the rank and file of the party, with the aim of bringing pressure to bear on the centres of economic, state and social decision-making. Reforms, they believe, should be aimed at changing the system.

The proponents of reform "within the system" claim that "system-transcending" reforms will result in political and economic catastrophe. Intervention in the capitalist system, they claim, and the harsh response this will provoke, will only bring about a worsening of the material situation of the people. "Those who want to transform or destroy the system," declared Peter Glotz, a West

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

² François Mitterrand, *L'homme. Les idées*, p. 78.

³ *Le peuple*, November 19, 1974.

⁴ Eric S. Heffer, *Op. cit.*, p. 384.

German Social Democrat, "should not expect to act with moderation, democratically and in a parliamentary fashion."¹ But these intentions radically contradict the very idea of "democratic socialism".

In the light of this the differing attitudes towards the totality of reforms which appear under the heading "the quality of life" become clear. Until the aggravation of the crisis of capitalism in the late seventies this idea had been developed by the SDPG who were principally concerned to find a blanket definition that would include the various aspects of social life—material and psychological conditions of work, daily life and leisure, environmental situation, access to education and culture, etc.—that one way or another affect the life and work of the individual. According to the originators of this concept the demand for improving the "quality of life" envisages a transition from a one-sided approach to economic growth to an approach that is orientated on the requirements of the individual. Hence the conclusion that reforms ought to be coordinated so as to affect every aspect of social life and lead to the creation of a fundamentally new social infrastructure.

Thus, on the question of the various approaches to reform we can sum up by saying that under the influence of a number of factors modern social-democratic reformism has acquired a certain leftist hue. In their desire to disassociate themselves from the bourgeois parties which virtually without exception have today adopted slogans that propose social and even political reform, the member parties of the Socialist International have worked out new ideas which are intended to win over the masses to their own particular brand of social reformism. These reforms, however, take on a more radical character on those occasions when the Social Democrats have contacts with the communist parties in their respective countries or when they are trying to win the working people away from the latter's influence. And one finds that the reformism of the left wing offers more favourable opportunities for dialogue in the framework of the burgeoning unity of action by Communists and Social Democrats.

¹ Peter Glotz, "Systemüberwindende Reformen? Strategische Überlegungen zur Technik von Machterwerb und Machterhalt in der Bundesrepublik". In: *Beiträge zur Theoriediskussion*, Verlag, J. H. W. Dietz Nachf., GmbH, Berlin-Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1973, p. 228.

6. "Democratic Socialism"—a Variety of Anti-Communism

Alongside reformism, the result of bourgeois influence on the working class, the working-class movement is also penetrated by anti-communism, spread by the right social-democratic ideologists. But this does not mean that bourgeois and imperialist anti-communism are identical with their right-wing socialist variety. On the contrary, it is quite clear that whereas anti-communism is inherent in the ideology and politics of the imperialist bourgeoisie, it is ideologically and from a class point of view alien to the working-class movement, part of which is social-democratic. It is this circumstance that largely influences the character of right-wing socialist anti-communism and defines its specific characteristics within anti-communism as a whole. For this reason the Communists' fight against anti-communism in the social-democratic parties is not only part of the ideological struggle, but an attempt to overcome the split in the working class and unify it under the banner of common class interests and aims.

The specific characteristic of right-wing socialist anti-communism derives from the internal contradiction between the effective transition to the class positions of the bourgeoisie inherent in such views and the objective need to maintain a high level of anti-capitalist orientation. It becomes particularly apparent in the fact that reformist politics under the intensified contradictions of capitalism have been forced to adapt to the demands of capitalist reality, the real nature of which becomes daily clearer to the working masses.

Furthermore, this specific characteristic manifests itself in the type of thing the right-wing Social Democrats place at the centre of their basic anti-communist concepts. It is anchored in the very nature of social-democratic ideology as an ideology of opportunism. The basic ideological differences between Communists and Social Democrats cover such issues as ways and means for the transition to socialism, the nature of the concept of "socialism" and the concepts of freedom, dictatorship and democracy. These ideological differences taken by themselves do not amount to anti-communism. For the majority of the rank-and-file Social Democrats they are the result of reformist illusions and their failure to understand the historic significance of existing socialism for the whole world. But many of the right-wing social-democratic leaders and ideologists exploit these differences in falsifying existing socialism and levelling slander against it. This is right-wing socialist anti-communism, which may be described as "democratic" anti-communism. The imperialist bourgeoisie is

well aware of the possibilities offered by the "democratic" anti-communism of the right-wing social-democratic ideologists in furthering its anti-working-class policies, insofar as this form of anti-communism is clothed in the guise of anti-capitalism.

The social reformist ideologists characterize their position as being opposed both to imperialism and communism and forming what they term a "third way", the way of "democratic socialism". " 'Democratic socialism', " according to Bruno Pittermann, a well-known Austrian Social Democrat, "stands in strong opposition to both monopoly capitalism and any form of totalitarian economic planning [which in right-wing socialist phraseology means the economic system in the socialist countries. — *Auth.*]." ¹

One of the characteristic features of right social-democratic anti-communism is its propaganda. Realizing that primitive anti-communist propaganda does not produce the desired effect the right social-democratic ideologists have developed a "theoretical foundation" of its most "effective" forms. They know that open slanderous attacks, direct ideological and political provocation and crude, unsubstantiated attempts to discredit the social and political system in the socialist countries despite the obvious achievements of socialism in all spheres of economics, politics, science and culture deprive them of the moral right to act as "advocates of social progress and democracy". They are well aware that anti-communist crusades are doomed to failure. The genuinely popular domestic and foreign policies pursued by the socialist countries and the consistent struggle waged by Communists in the capitalist countries in the interests of the working people have made the very concept of "anti-communism" so odious and discreditable that it arouses negative associations even among those strata of society which it would be difficult to suspect of holding communist sympathies. Public opinion in the capitalist countries has made the concept of "anti-communism" almost equivalent to that of "reactionary". Anti-communism today, declared Brandt, is used as a camouflage for the struggle against every kind of progress. ²

Nevertheless, anti-communism remains an important part of the ideological platform of contemporary social democracy, particularly its right wing. The numerous theories advanced in

¹ Bruno Pittermann, *Zur Strategie der sozialistischen Bewegung*. In: *Die Zukunft*, Vienna, Heft 15-16, 1970, p. 24.

² Quoted from "Seminar of Socialist Research Departments". In: *Socialist Affairs*, Vol. XXI. No. 1, 1971, p. 23.

support of these anti-communist views may be divided into two groups. First, there are the theories designed to "refute" or discredit Marxist-Leninist teaching as a whole or one or other of its aspects. Second, there are the theories which largely can be reduced to attempts to discredit the practice of building socialism as it is carried out in the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union, and the experience of the revolutionary working-class movement. The reverse side of these anti-communist concepts, and at the same time an integral part of them, is the apologia for the capitalist socio-political and economic system, which is also decked out in a whole stream of concepts and theories.

For many years now right-wing socialist ideologists have tried to show the "obsolescence" of Marxism. This they try to do today by showing that Marxism-Leninism is in fact "pluralist". The essence of the method consists in trying to drown the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin in a sea of right and "left" revisionist deviations. Thus Gunther Bartsch, a West German anti-communist ideologist, claims that various currents in the New Left movement are nothing but forms of "neo-Marxism" which have arisen as a counterpoise to the "old", "dogmatic" Marxism.¹ All the deviations from Marxism-Leninism and its nationalist and petty-bourgeois interpretations are proclaimed by the anti-communist ideologists as "new", "national" forms of Marxism. They see in right and "left" opportunism evidence of what they refer to as the "polycentrism" of the international communist movement. "The world today," declared Bruno Kreisky in an interview in early 1976, "is faced with tri-polar and even multi-polar communism."² Statements of this kind are, of course, a direct falsification of the real situation, since, in the first place, all forms of revisionism by their very nature cannot be forms of Marxism inasmuch as they are distorted and subversive interpretations, and, in the second place, because they magnify the scale influence of opportunism.

Another method designed to subvert the ideology of scientific communism is to oppose the "new", "humanist" Marxism to the "old", "mature" Marxism and to oppose Lenin to Marx and Leninism to Marxism. This type of opposition constitutes one of the main trends in anti-communist falsification of Marxist-Leninist theory.

The right socialist theoreticians oppose Leninism to Marxism

¹ *Das Parlament*, No. 42, 1971, p. 14.

² "Bruno Kreisky über Sozialdemokratie und Kommunismus. Ein Gespräch mit Paul Lendvai". In: *Europäische Rundschau*, Vienna, No. 2, 1976, p. 4.

primarily on the fundamental questions of the socialist revolution and the organizational principles and functions of a working-class party. Everything that Lenin did to deepen and creatively develop Marxism is dismissed by them as being in contradiction to Marxism.

By thus falsifying the unity of Marxist-Leninist teaching, the right social-democratic ideologists try to prove that Leninism has a limited sphere of application, being restricted to pre-capitalist or underdeveloped capitalist society.

The ideological and political aim of this is clear, to degrade Leninism, make it appear primitive and depict it as being of local significance only and therefore inapplicable to the world as a whole and developed capitalist societies. Thereby the impression is created that Leninism is not acceptable to the working class in the capitalist countries, who constitute the main target for the political activity of the Social Democrats.

Far more important, though, is the other tendency in right socialist anti-communism—the falsification of the practice of Marxism-Leninism and socio-political development in the socialist countries.

Following in the footsteps of the bourgeois ideologists the right-wing socialist theoreticians falsify the nature of the socialist revolution. They claim, for example, that the necessary material preconditions did not exist for the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, for capitalism at that time had not sufficiently developed in Russia. Stated directly and accompanied by attempts to oppose Leninism to Marxism this claim is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the fact of Russia's pre-revolutionary economic backwardness as compared with the level of economic development in Britain, Germany and the United States in the early twentieth century. It ignores the fact that Russia was also undergoing the process of capitalist monopolization and that the levels of concentration and organization of the working class in industry (a factor to which reformists are not inclined to give paramount importance) was quite high. Russia occupied an important place in the world capitalist economy since it was a hive of imperialist contradictions. Lenin's theory of imperialism, which developed Marxism as applied to the historical conditions that had arisen, and his scientific substantiation of the laws and inevitability of the socialist revolution in Russia have been proved by the whole subsequent course of history.

In their readiness to belittle the Soviet experience in every possible way, right socialist ideologists falsify the economic basis of

the socialist system and deny the socialist character of the economy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, claiming that it consists of some kind of "totalitarian state capitalism". Closely linked to this thesis is their similar distortion of the social nature of socialism. "International Communism," states the programme document of the Socialist International, entitled "Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism", "is the instrument of a new imperialism... By producing glaring contrasts of wealth and privilege it has created a new class society."¹ Thus, according to this thesis, the laws which exist under capitalism (in which property and class divisions largely coincide) automatically exist under socialism too, which knows no class antagonisms. These and similar assertions are designed, of course, to dupe the "average" man in the street in the capitalist world, who is literally enmeshed on all sides by a web of anti-communist propaganda. But as the truth of the achievements of socialism becomes known to increasingly wider numbers, the effectiveness of this type of propaganda falls sharply.

Communists have never made a secret of the fact that under socialism material abundance has not yet been achieved and that the unavoidable differences in income are a transitory phenomenon which is being gradually overcome. "Socialism," Lenin noted, "is not a ready-made system that will be mankind's benefactor. Socialism is the class struggle of the present-day proletariat as it advances from one objective today to another objective tomorrow for the sake of its basic objective, to which it is coming nearer every day."²

Socialism has done away with the division of society into exploiters and exploited, into those who own the means of production and those who do not and it is this that constitutes the practical achievement of its main aim—the elimination of all forms of class antagonism.

In denying the theory of scientific communism and the experience of existing socialism the right Social Democrats do not transcend the framework of bourgeois liberalism. They try to reduce the struggle for democracy to a "social partnership" with the bourgeoisie and the struggle for socialism to merely "bits of patchwork", which, as Lenin pointed out, "often divert fighters from the truly revolutionary path."³ It is precisely this that shows

¹ *Declarations of the Socialist International*, p. 3.

² V. I. Lenin, "Conversation", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, 1968, p. 46.

³ V. I. Lenin, "The Latest in *Iskra* Tactics, or Mock Elections as a New Incentive to an Uprising", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, 1977, p. 372.

the close link between anti-communism and capitalist apologetics in right-wing socialist ideology.

In recent years some of the positions held by international social democracy have undergone definite changes. This is particularly so in the sphere of foreign policy. Blatant and militant anti-communism and anti-Sovietism together with hostility to the policy of peaceful coexistence, which is pursued by the socialist countries have gradually given way to a more realistic approach. International detente has become an important factor in the struggle to eliminate anti-communism from the ranks of the social-democratic movement and the struggle for working-class unity. Detente has visibly demonstrated the depth of the crisis in the anti-communist ideology of social reformism and created conditions in which it is becoming increasingly difficult if not impossible to capitalize on a mythical "external threat" as the explanation for the various crises which beset the capitalist economy. The relaxation of international tension has brought into relief the internal contradictions in capitalism which are inherent in it and which have been intensified during the present stage of its general crisis. It cuts away the foundations of anti-communist propaganda, showing the scientific nature of the Marxist-Leninist policies pursued by the communist parties both at home and abroad. Detente has been an important factor in raising the class consciousness of the working people and in promoting the broader expansion of the ideas of socialism.

But at the same time under conditions of detente the ideological struggle has intensified. Anti-communists of all types are using new means to discredit the domestic and foreign policies of the socialist countries and undermine the positions of the international communist movement. In this situation the social-democratic anti-communists have been unable to resist the temptation to exploit detente as providing new opportunities for attacks on Marxism-Leninism. The reasons for this are clear. Every achievement of the socialist countries, at home or in the international arena, is one more piece of evidence for the vital force of integral international Marxist-Leninist teaching, on the one hand, and, on the other, for the bankruptcy of the right reformist model of social development. Therefore, it is quite understandable that such a major success of socialist foreign policy as the achievement of a transition from cold war to detente should give rise to new anti-communist attempts to conceal the real nature of what is taking place in the world and belittle the role of the socialist countries, guided as they are by the ideas of scientific communism and proletarian internationalism.

The desire to undermine the international character of

Marxism-Leninism which has always had an important place in the strategy of anti-communism, has now become one of its main targets. In recent times anti-communist ideologists have increasingly tried in their propaganda campaigns to oppose working-class unity on a national scale to proletarian internationalism. In doing this they confront Communists in the capitalist countries with the demand to renounce their links with the communist parties in other, particularly the socialist, countries and refrain from recognizing the international character of Marxism-Leninism as well as general laws of the socialist revolution and socialist construction, which have been tried and tested in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and all this is the price for their cooperation over domestic issues. Thus Olof Palme, leader of the Swedish Social Democrats, considers that the communist parties in the capitalist countries should "change their ideology" on three particular points: 1) renounce the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and recognize the pluralist state and bourgeois freedoms; 2) renounce so-called proletarian internationalism, which in their opinion amounts to the hegemony of the Soviet Communist Party; 3) renounce democratic centralism, which "is a purely elitist political concept".¹ These demands are echoed by Bruno Kreisky: "If the Communists really want to become democrats they should discard far more than the simple conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat.... Nothing of what was specific to communism would be left...."²

In other words, Communists are being told neither more nor less than to become social reformists.

Marxists-Leninists resolutely reject ideological subversion of this kind. They emphasize that internationalism is a powerful and reliable weapon in the hands of the working class and that to set the national responsibilities of Communists against their international responsibilities is to distort the very nature of the communist movement. "Anti-Communism," stresses the final document of the Berlin Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, "is and remains an instrument which imperialist and reactionary forces use not only against Communists but also against other democrats and against democratic freedoms. These forces are conducting campaigns against the Communist Parties, the socialist countries, beginning with the Soviet Union, against the forces of socialism and progress, campaigns which aim

to discredit the policy and the ideals of Communists among the mass of the people and to prevent unity within the working-class movement and cooperation among the democratic and popular forces. It is in the interests of the aspiration of the popular forces for progress and for democratic development to isolate and overcome anti-Communism."¹

The right reformist ideologists slander internationalism on the grounds that it serves as a justification for some parties to intervene in the affairs of others and for some parties to establish hegemony over others. This kind of fabrication is refuted by reality. It is precisely the solidarity and mutual assistance that exist between the fraternal parties that serve as a reliable guarantee of their independence and the strength of their positions in the face of imperialist attack. In relying on the support of the working class and broad strata of the working people, the communist parties pursue a class and genuinely international policy and confront the enemies of peace and social progress with their own solidarity and resoluteness to wage a consistent struggle for achieving the vital interests of the proletariat.

Thus we see that the ideology of "democratic socialism" as propagated by the right-wing social-democratic leadership and anti-communism which accompanies it are directed not against capitalism, but against scientific socialism.

¹ *L'Espresso*, Rome, No. 26, 1976, p. 43.

² *Socialist Affairs*, Vol. 27, No. 5, 1977, p. 119.

¹ *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe*. Berlin, June 29-30, 1976, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1976, pp. 41-42.

Chapter II

IDEOLOGICAL TRENDS IN "DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM"

The ideas of "democratic socialism" are reflected in the theory and practice not only of the Social Democrats and Socialists. Similar concepts, although in a somewhat modified form, can be found in other political trends which, on the one hand, claim to be socialist in character, and, on the other, to stand in opposition to scientific, Marxist socialism. The desire on the part of those political forces, which are themselves far removed from the socialist movement, to give nevertheless socialist colouring to their ideological weaponry bears witness to their enforced recognition of the power and popularity of socialist ideas and the inevitability of the historical transition from capitalism to socialism.

In their struggle against the communist movement and Marxist-Leninist teaching the right revisionists and renegades also appeal to the ideas of "democratic socialism".

1. "Democratic Socialism" and the Right Revisionists and Renegades

Those right revisionists who trail in the ranks of the communist movement are characterized by their renunciation of the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism, their exaggeration of the role of reform instead of revolution, their underestimation of extra-parliamentary mass forms of struggle and the paramount importance they attach to the technological intelligentsia as a force capable of ensuring the "transformation" of capitalism. In the field of organization the right revisionists and renegades tend towards belittling the role of the party and liquidationism accompanied by a renunciation of the principles of democratic

centralism. All this to a considerable degree has been borrowed from the hotchpotch of ideas that constitutes "democratic socialism".

Right revisionists, particularly such renegades as Garaudy, Šik and Marek aim the thrust of their attacks not against the class enemy, but against the communist parties which hold Marxist-Leninist positions. They try to "modernize" Marxism, which is to say turn it into "democratic socialism" by altering its fundamental concepts. To back up their concepts they do everything to propagate "pluralist" models of socialism. And the point of all this is to provoke a split in the world socialist system and international communist movement.

These new "models of socialism" in fact amount to political mechanism of formal bourgeois democracy and class-antagonistic society being transferred to a completely different, socialist, society, where there are no class contradictions, no opposing interests and where the bourgeois criteria of democracy are unacceptable.

The spiritual kinship between right revisionists and social reformists is particularly clear in their attachment to one of the new varieties of "democratic socialism"—the concept of "socialism with a human face". The ideas comprised by this theory openly reject the economic system of existing socialism, overestimate the transformationary possibilities of state-monopoly capitalism, consciously replace the relationship between the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy with the relationship between dictatorship and democracy and generally give a distorted representation of the practical mechanism of democratic centralism. All this is with the aim of building some abstract "socialism with a human face" as a counterpoise to existing socialism.

Borrowing their ideas from social reformism, the right revisionists try to "rebuild" real people on the basis of an abstract, non-class concept of the individual, his anthropological characteristics and vague ideas about freedom "in general". They conceive of socialist society not as the result of class struggle and revolutionary change, but as a spontaneous movement towards a non-class, all-embracing moral ideal.

The all-round development of the human personality requires a totality of material, social and cultural prerequisites and in an exploitative society these prerequisites cannot be guaranteed for the majority of the population. Socialism creates the real conditions for the individual development of all working people in

society. Hence the complexity of the process of educating the new man and the reality of socialist humanism.

Thus an analysis of the fundamental characteristics of the right revisionist "model of socialism", which is advanced as an alternative to scientific socialism, reveals how far their originators have departed from the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism and how opposed their views are to the fundamental ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

In economics the revisionist "models of socialism" are characterized by distortion of socialist relations of production, the free play of market forces and an "open door" policy towards economic patterns based on private ownership. In politics they lead to the genuinely socialist political system degenerating into a kind of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois democracy. In the intellectual field they simply open the doors wide to bourgeois ideology which results in the intellectual enslavement of the individual. All of which goes to show the deeply reactionary nature of such "models of socialism" as designed by the revisionists.

The bourgeoisie and the working class have completely antagonistic aims: one fights for the maintenance of the existing capitalist order; the other continually struggles towards a socialist revolution, which it sees as the means to its own freedom and the freedom of the whole exploited and oppressed part of society. The guiding role of the working class in the revolutionary struggle is shown by the fact that it stands at the head of a broad anti-imperialist front.

But for the revisionists the working class is just a "rank-and-file" element in the revolutionary movement. They assert the autonomy of each group of participants in the anti-monopoly struggle. This view amounts to belittling the role of the working class, splitting the revolutionary forces, isolating each of them within the framework of its own limited aims and in effect obliterating the main strategic goal, which is the overthrow of the existing social system.

In their attempts to compromise the leading role of the working class in socialist society the revisionists claim, for instance, that working-class leadership leads to some kind of "domination" over the intelligentsia. But where else, unless in the imagination of the revisionists themselves, who are ready to stoop to the basest slander, is the matter seen in this way? Both Marxist-Leninist theory and existing socialism convincingly show that the leading role of the working class in socialist society does not in the least mean that this class has some special privileges over the social

groups or that its leadership is to the detriment of their interests, status or social function. This would be in contradiction to the spirit, the foundations and the laws of socialism.

Unity and solidarity are the essential features of socialist social relations. The leading role of the working class is inseparably linked with its growing cooperation with all social groups for the purpose of fulfilling the tasks of socialist and communist construction.

In an attempt to unite their own followers, the renegades try to show that their revisionism is a creative development of Marxism-Leninism. But what kind of a creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory is it, if their aims coincide not only with the theoretical postulates of social reformism but also with the blatant anti-Soviet and anti-communist aims of international imperialism?

Bourgeois propagandists have even worked out criteria of "acceptability" of socialism and for judging "reasonable Communists". These criteria, which were developed by none less than Zbigniew Brzezinski and his associates, amount to the following:

- disassociation from the Soviet Union and, as they put it, its "dictates";
- promotion of "democracy" as defined by big business, and of "socialism with a human face";
- ending democratic centralism;
- advancing policies which correspond to the national traditions of individual countries and mute the class struggle;
- ceasing criticism of US policies of aggression (and at times when this is inevitable, equating the US with the Soviet Union).¹

An objective analysis of the above leads to the inevitable conclusion that the revisionists are trying to:

- set the communist parties in the European capitalist countries against those in the socialist countries;
- discredit existing socialism in the countries in which a socialist society has already been built, particularly the Soviet Union;
- refute all the conclusions which are arrived at jointly by all the European Communists and reject the aims of their struggle for the interests of the working class and all the working people, for peace, democracy and social progress.

A comparison of the aims of international imperialism and contemporary revisionism shows the results of ignoring the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and making unscientific

¹ *World Marxist Review*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1978, p. 57.

attempts to discover "new" ways for the transformation of society.

The basic direction for contemporary revisionism consists in revising or discarding the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and "criticizing" the socio-economic achievements of existing socialism going as far as denying the victory of socialist relations of production.

Of particular theoretical and practical importance under contemporary conditions are such questions as the international significance of Marxism-Leninism, the integral essence and variety of the many forms of socialist revolution and socialist construction and the universal laws and specifically national characteristics of the communist transformation of the world. The right revisionists, who have capitalized on some of the real difficulties facing the application of Marxist theory to certain specific conditions in various countries, are doing all in their power to replace the integral theory and all-important practical experience in building a communist formation by various "national" and "regional" interpretations of Marxism and "models of socialism". In distorting the essence of socialism as it exists, or as it is successfully developing, the various critics of Marxism-Leninism, particularly the right revisionists, either deny directly, or attempt to conceal the general laws of the development of socialism, absolutizing the various national and regional peculiarities of this development in different countries. Under the slogan of the "creative development" and "renewal" of scientific communism and the widespread propaganda for "democratic socialism", these "critics" try to drag into the communist movement ideas which have nothing in common at all with Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

In its preparations for splitting the international communist movement revisionism tries to make what it calls "creative alterations" to the concept of proletarian internationalism which virtually amounts to setting the working class in the socialist countries against the working class in the capitalist countries. This clearly has nothing to do with genuine proletarian internationalism. The revisionists are bent on causing a split between the communist parties of Western Europe and the communist parties in the socialist countries, between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the communist parties in the other socialist countries and finally within the communist parties in the capitalist countries. This orientation in the policies of contemporary revisionism has received the full and unconditional support of international social reformist movement. It was precisely this "isolation" of the West

European communist movement that was discussed at the Socialist International Congress in Switzerland in 1977 and this type of "regeneration" that Bruno Kreisky has been calling for.

But revision of Marxism-Leninism is being undertaken not only on matters which relate to a "new" interpretation of proletarian internationalism. Many of the questions of revolutionary theory are being subjected to reappraisal. Disdaining theory, rejecting it and reassessing its fundamentals are the characteristic features of revisionism past and present. Modern revisionists are more open about their revisionism. They now state categorically that they reject Marxism-Leninism since they consider much of Leninism to be obsolete. Therefore, what possible development of revolutionary theory can there be, when the rejection of the very essence of that theory is stated from the outset? In point of fact, this respectable concept of "creative development" only serves to conceal the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and the adherence to other, chiefly anti-Marxist concepts. "New" in contemporary revisionist thinking refers only to the present-day situation, while the forms and methods employed and particularly the conclusions reached coincide astonishingly with the positions held by the revisionists of the past. These "new" features incidentally are found in abundance in the writings of the right social-democratic leaders, liberals, anarchists, etc.

Experience has shown that revisionists always start out by opposing their own views to the fundamental principles of scientific communism and then inevitably take their stand alongside the anti-communists. This is chiefly reflected in their desire to "eradicate" the fundamental tenets from Marxism-Leninism. More often than not they reject the class approach to evaluating current events, which in turn inevitably leads to a rejection of the class struggle.

The right revisionist interpretation of democracy is virtually aimed at ousting the working class from their leading role in the building of socialism. Reducing the democratic path to socialism to broad participation in the socialist movement by different sections of working people, intelligentsia, youth and other non-proletarian groups the revisionists are practically advocating that the working class renounce their claim to the leading role in the struggle for socialism and become just another rank-and-file group in the socialist movement. This idea in practice amounts to weakening the motive forces behind the socialist reconstruction of society and destroying the principle of the leading role of the working class that gives coherence and purpose to the whole cause of socialism and a true socialist orientation.

Right-wing revisionist critics and renegades distort Marxism-Leninism by absolutizing the peaceful roads to working-class power and the subsequent building of a socialist society. At the basis of the absolutization we can similarly trace the concept of "democratic socialism", according to which only the peaceful seizure of power by the working class can be considered democratic. They fail to understand that any form of the seizure of power by the working class is democratic by its very nature. Whether the workers take power by peaceful means or by armed revolt is immaterial. It does not affect the essence of the socialist revolution—which is the eradication of the exploitation of man by man, the transformation of a state which exists to serve the interests of the minority into a state whose main purpose is concern for the interests of all working people.

Absolutization of the peaceful road to socialism as the only democratic way leads the renegades to the traditional theory and practice of social democracy, i. e., a renunciation of the struggle for socialism. They state quite openly that though a parliamentary party that supports the socialist reconstruction of society might come to power, this same party might also be forced to hand back that power in the event of their failing to achieve the necessary majority at the next elections. Thus, in order to suit their peaceful path to socialism, which is falsely understood as the only true democratic way, the right revisionists refuse to defend the socialist gains they might win. For them the most important thing is not the victory of socialism, but the observance of the bourgeois principle of democracy. In doing this they blind themselves to the fact that reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries have no intention of tolerating a peaceful, parliamentary transition to people's power, as has been shown only too well by the experience of Chile. On the contrary, the forces of reaction will do all they can, even going to the extent of a military coup, for the return of the power they have lost.

The non-class approach of the revisionists to political events leads to a completely distorted representation of the strategy of revolutionary development, as a result of which the forces of imperialism and reaction are either overestimated or underestimated. As in the case of social reformists overestimation leads to a lack of faith in the potential of the working class with the result that the revisionists believe, for example, that the scientific and technical revolution is yet another trump in the hands of the capitalists, while the working class lacks the know-how and experience, the necessary knowledge in science, technology,

government and international affairs to solve the problems it faces. Underestimation of the capabilities of imperialism leads to the short-sighted concept that imperialism has given up the idea of unleashing war.

The Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class have always waged an implacable struggle against revisionism, exposing its subversive activity as the proponent of social reformist ideas in the working-class and communist movement. It is the prime duty of every individual communist party to combat opportunism within its own ranks, but the result of this struggle is of the greatest importance for all the other communist parties and the whole communist movement. Communists, who have imbibed the ideas of proletarian internationalism and are ready to extend assistance to all those who think as they do, are firmly opposed to revisionism, wherever it may emerge.

The unity among Communist internationalists and their concern for the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory cause stormy reactions from the revisionists, who see manifestations of this type of solidarity as intervention in the internal affairs of other parties. But at the same time they consider it perfectly normal and natural to support revisionists and even social reformists from other countries, and criticize the activities of Communists in other parties.

Revisionism under the flag of the "creative development" of Marxism-Leninism amounts in fact to a negation of the latter and an attack on existing socialism. In trying to "demonstrate the imperfections" of scientific communism, it distorts the real changes that are taking place in the countries where socialism is being put into practice and where the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin has become a reality.

One of the characteristic features of revisionism in its carping criticism of Marxism-Leninism and refusal to recognize the socialist nature of those countries, where the ideas of scientific communism are being visibly put into practice, is the fact that the revisionists themselves have been unable to put forward any positive concept as to the nature of socialism and the means to its construction apart from repeating the well-known propositions of the social reformists.

2. The Left-Wing Catholics and Their Interpretation of Socialism

The tide of revolutionary change has not been without its effect on the world's Catholic populations. Today there is a growing movement of workers, peasants, intelligentsia and various other

social strata, all of whom profess the Catholic faith, towards socialism.

According to a leader in *Témoignage chrétien*, the French left-wing Catholic weekly, "more and more Christians are voting communist".¹

In a similar vein the Spanish left-wing Catholic, E. Obregón, declares that socialism is the only natural centre of gravity for the Christian consciousness.

Left Catholics identifying themselves with socialism have formed a number of national and international organizations. These include Christians for Socialism (Latin America), the Organization of Catholic Socialists (Austria), the French Democratic Confederation of Labour and others.

Furthermore, in recent years there has been a powerful influx of Catholics joining the socialist parties. For instance, they now play a major part in the French Socialist Party.

Of course, all these left-wing Catholics and their numerous organizations hold somewhat peculiar views as far as the notion of "socialism" is concerned. But largely they boil down to a form of "democratic socialism", which they refer to as "communitarian", "humanitarian", etc.

Their doctrine, which is highly eclectic, is made up of an accumulation of concepts borrowed from the official teachings of the Catholic Church, the "democratic socialism" of the Social Democrats and the theories of the liberal bourgeoisie. Recent years have seen a number of left-wing Catholics getting carried away by the extremist teachings of the Maoists, the Trotskyites and the Anarchists.²

But, on the other hand, some left Catholics recognize the authority of Marx.

What are the fundamentals of the Catholic concept of "democratic socialism"?

The left-wing Catholics have come to socialism via Christianity. They consider that socialism grew out of the Christian teaching, from which it took its best elements and that these were put into practice in the social life of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Therefore, Catholic acceptance of socialism is, as they see it, a return to the ideals of early Christianity. For them there are no

¹ *Témoignage chrétien*, December 21, 1972, p. 3.

² Admiration for the teachings of Maoism, for example, is contained in the work "Chinese in Europe" by the Austrian left-wing Catholic Wilfried Daim. (W. Daim, *Chinesen in Europa*, Vienna-Munich, 1975).

great differences between "pure" (i. e. "democratic") socialism and "pure" Christianity.

Though they proclaim themselves supporters of socialism many left Catholics do not admit the success achieved by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in the building of socialism and orientate their propaganda around the lie that there are no religious freedoms in these countries.

There is a well-advanced tendency among "democratic socialist" Catholics to accuse "Soviet socialism" of not paying sufficient attention to the individual and to moral and ethical values, of being, in the words of Alfonso Comin, "a new variety of Jacobin productivism".¹ For them, central to "democratic socialism" should be the problem of man.

Like the Social Democrats, the Catholic "democratic socialists" give a moderate criticism of capitalism and hope for its "peaceful transformation", while rejecting the revolutionary road to social change. They believe in what they call "organized" capitalism, which via "democratic planning" will be able to overcome the vices inherent in that social formation.

Though recognizing the fact of the class struggle, the left Catholics do not see it as a means for realizing the interests of the working people. They are more concerned with "peaceful" paths to the achievement of this end. Thus, for example, in 1970 the French Democratic Confederation of Labour included in its programme the goal of creating a "democratic socialist" society via the development of self-government.

Left Catholics criticize the leadership of the Catholic Church for its close ties with the ruling circles in capitalist society. According to August Knoll, a well-known Austria left-wing Catholic, the Church has gone too long without a positive programme for social change² and has therefore failed to give its timely attention to the working people.

The Catholic adherents of "democratic socialism" are trying to cooperate with the non-Catholic Social Democrats. For their part the latter look upon the former as their ideological allies and have no serious differences of opinion with them. In some programme documents of social democracy an attempt is even made to show theoretically that it is necessary for the social-democratic

¹ Alfonso Comin, *Struttura capitalista, lotte sociali e prossi di chiesa*, Madrid, 1970, p. 212.

² See: August M. Knoll, *Katholische Kirche und scholastisches Naturrecht*, Europa Verlag, Vienna, 1962.

movement to join forces with the Church and forget the differences of opinion that lay between them in the past.

But while noting the kinship between the left Catholic concept of "democratic socialism" and social democracy it should not be forgotten that the ideology and practice of certain left-wing Catholic groups contain a number of features which make it possible and even expedient for the Communists to hold a dialogue and to unite action with them, as well as to step up efforts for the clarification of the ideological and political positions of the communist movement.

These features include:

—recognition by many left-wing Catholics of the prestige and importance of the communist party and its role in socio-political life, and the realization that without the Communists none of the vitally important problems of capitalist society can be solved. According to Georges Montaron, a prominent figure in the French left-wing Catholic movement, "It is impossible in France to struggle against the power of finance, uphold social justice and promote democratic freedoms without the support of the popular masses that are grouped around the Communist Party."¹

—the declared agreement by many left-wing Catholics with the conclusions of Marxism on the ultimate historical collapse of capitalism and the recognition, although with some reservations, of the authority of Marxism. A representative of the French left-wing Catholic students' movement declared in 1972 in a speech to the Plenary Assembly of French Episcopature that Marxist methodology appeared to him an effective means for analyzing reality and building socialism;

—the recognition of the leading role of the working class. This is usually found in the documents issued by the various workers' organizations of Catholic Action and Christian trade unions. One of the leaders of the Chilean left Catholics, Luis Badilla Morales, in an analysis of the experience of the Chile, stressed the importance of "working-class hegemony" which he considered as the basic prerequisite for the building of a society based on the principles of social justice²;

—the support for international peace and social justice. Many left-wing Catholics, though upholding their concept of "democratic socialism", have taken an active part in the campaigns for peace and against imperialist aggression.

¹ *Témoignage chrétien*, December 21, 1972, p. 3.

² *Testimonianze*, Florence, No. 160, 1973, pp. 806-07.

On the basis of this Communists believe that it is possible to consider the left Catholics as a force which is capable of making its contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle. They therefore carry out a programme of patient, explanatory work among the left-wing Catholics, hold ideological discussions with them which are designed to overcome their simplistic and incorrect understanding of socialist ideals and call upon left-wing Catholics to enter into joint action with Communists in their struggle against imperialism and for social progress.

The final document of the 1976 Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe noted the important role played in the struggle for the rights of the working people, for democracy and peace by ever broader Catholic forces and members of other religious communities, both Christian and non-Christian. The communist and workers' parties, the document goes to say, recognize the necessity of dialogue and joint action with these forces, which is an inseparable part of the struggle for the development of Europe in a spirit of democracy and in the direction of social progress.¹

This position held by Communists has nothing to do with ideological concessions. As Leonid Brezhnev pointed out, "It is especially important that while joining with broad democratic trends, including Social Democrats and Christians, in the struggle against the reactionary forces of imperialism, the Communists should remain revolutionaries and convinced supporters of the replacement of the capitalist by the socialist system."²

3. The Democratic Socialist Party of Japan

Until the Second World War the concept of "democratic socialism" was chiefly current in the industrialized countries of capitalist Europe. But after the war, and particularly during the last decades, "democratic socialism" as an ideological platform has been chosen by a number of parties in such industrialized and industrial-agrarian countries as Japan, Australia and New Zealand.

The Democratic Socialist Party of Japan actually uses the concept in its own official title. So what interpretation does it give to the concept of "democratic socialism"?

¹ *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe*. Berlin, June 29-30, 1976, p. 43.

² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

The DSP was formed in January 1960 by extreme right groups which broke away from the Socialist Party of Japan. According to the DSP programme the main reason for the split was "ideological conflict between the democratic socialists and the Marxist socialists".¹ The immediate cause of the split were the differences of opinion on the Japanese-American military alliance during the period of the mass campaign against the US-Japanese Treaty of Security. The founders of the DSP supported the treaty and from that time on, as the Japanese Communists point out, the DSP has pursued a "pro-American, pro-liberal democratic, anti-communist policy".² The social base of the DSP, as of the social-democratic parties in Western Europe, is the middle and petty bourgeoisie and the upper ranks of the working class. The party is closely linked with ruling circles, from whom it receives material support.

The Party Programme, adopted at the Fourth Congress of the DSP in January 1962,³ was written in the spirit of the Frankfurt Declaration, but at the same time bore the stamp of that evolution which social democracy had undergone by the early sixties. The DSP defines itself as a "political party of working people belonging to different strata of society, including workers, peasants, fishermen, shopkeepers, factory owners, the technical intelligentsia, civil servants, professional people, homeowners, etc." The Programme states: "Our party is not a class party that considers one particular class has the historic mission of bringing about socialism and expresses the interests of that class. Our party is a party which, while realizing the presence of conflicting interests among individual groups, recognizes the community of national interests." Thus the DSP puts itself on the extreme right of the international social-democratic movement among parties and groups like Italian Social Democratic Party.

The DSP Programme contains groundless attacks on scientific socialism such as: "Marx ... absolutized historical materialism, which is only one of many hypotheses ... underestimated the dangers of revolution and dictatorship ... was unable to find a scientific basis for democracy." On what it calls the "modern theory of building communism" the Programme contains crude attacks, which equate communism with fascism.

¹ DSP Programme. In: *The Democratic Socialist Party. Its Theory and Practice*. CPJ Publishing House, Tokyo, 1972, p. 280 (in Japanese).

² Yu. Nakadzava. "The DSP During the Period of Crisis". In: *The Democratic Socialist Party. Its Theory and Practice*, p. 11.

³ DSP Programme. In: *The Democratic Socialist Party. Its Theory and Practice*, pp. 277-90.

Among the "fundamental principles" preceding the text of the Programme, it states that "class interests" oppose the "free development of the individual" and the "people's interests". It stresses that the DSP is a "people's party" whose aim is to "oppose capitalism, right and left totalitarianism, free all members of society from oppression and exploitation and build a society which cares for human dignity and which makes possible the free development of the individual".

The section headed "Japanese Socialism" expresses the firm conviction that socialist ideas in their original (pre-Marxist) form are perfectly applicable to all countries, particularly Japan, so long as the concrete forms for the implementation of socialism correspond to the level of social development, scientific progress and the real situation in a given country. The programme defines the place and role of "democratic socialism" as a direct continuation of the original socialist ideals which had at their root the principles of "humanism".

The section headed "The Tasks that Face Us" notes that there are still "numerous shortcomings" in the developed capitalist countries, which can only be eliminated by "democratic socialism".

One of the fundamental principles of Japanese "democratic socialism" on which much of the practical activity of the DSP is based is the claim that worker participation in management and the general increase of technical expertise have led to the stratification of the working class and the break-away of a new middle strata. The complex system of social relations can no longer be confined within the framework of the "elementary confrontation between labour and capital" and the existing contradictions cannot be solved by means of the class struggle alone. This is particularly the case, they claim, in Japan, which in a short space of time has gone from a feudal to a highly developed capitalist state. The multi-structural Japanese economy contains super-monopolies, giant trusts and small-scale enterprises, frequently run by one family. Ten per cent of the population still own no property.

Nevertheless, the right wing of the Democratic Socialist Party of Japan point to the danger of violent revolution, which, according to them, only means "replacing one evil with another".

An important part of the Programme deals with the economy. In formulating the task of a socialist economy to consist in "raising the growth of productive forces and justly distributing the rewards of labour", the Japanese Social Democrats realize the need for

economic reform and technical progress. They propose the formation of an economy in which the "public interest" is given paramount importance. This is possible by means of the "rapid development of a welfare state on the basis of a mixed economy". While recognizing the need for economic planning in the interests of the rational utilization of national resources, the Programme at the same time opposes (except during a state of emergency) the introduction of a so-called "system of absolute distribution", which, the Japanese "democratic socialists" claim, destroys private initiative. The Programme also realizes the necessity in certain circumstances for the introduction of administrative control over capital investments and other economic mechanisms, but at the same time approves of the comprehensive utilization of the price formation mechanism and free competition. On the subject of nationalization it says: "We are opposed to nationalization for the sake of nationalization. We recognize public ownership and socialization of production as a just method serving the interests of society only when it is necessary to guarantee economic planning or bring huge economic potential under public control." State control is proposed for those industries "which are of vital importance for the national economy and require huge capital investments and state subsidies".

Thus the Japanese variety of "democratic socialism" contains the same apologetics for the capitalist system that are found in the theoretical works of West European right-wing social democracy. The mixed economy, the renunciation of public ownership of the means of production and maintenance of private ownership, the absence of any analysis of the activities of the monopolies and their influence on political and social life and the absolutization of the principles of "pluralist programme" all largely repeat the fundamental tenets of such documents as the Godesberg Programme of the SDPG.

In its section on foreign policy the Programme calls for "peace throughout the world not based on the force of arms", the ultimate goal of which should be the creation of a "world state". Though calling for an end to the arms race, the banning of atomic weapons and the conclusion of a disarmament treaty "based on a system of comprehensive control", the DSP advocates strengthening Japan's military potential, which is in fact in contradiction to the Japanese Constitution.

The foreign policy of the DSP was reflected in a speech by Ryosaku Sasaki, Chairman of the DSP, made on August 15, 1978 to mark the 33rd anniversary of the end of war in the Pacific

Ocean, in which he declared that the responsibility for aggression lay not with the imperialist powers but with the socialist and developing countries. "The cause of these wars," he went on to say, "comes not from the United States, Western Europe or Japan but from the changing course, including revolutions in major communist powers and developing countries." The DSP stands for strengthening the Treaty of Security with the United States, for the development of cooperation with Western Europe, particularly the FRG, and for a policy of equidistance in relations with the USSR and China.

The theory and practice of the DSP has come in for sharp and persistent criticism from the Communist Party of Japan, which looks upon the DSP as the "conservatives' Trojan horse". During the seventies, which are called in Japan the "era of a united front", the basic criterion for evaluating a given opposition party was the sincerity of its desire to "renew" the existing system. On the basis of an analysis of the DSP's theory and practice and its evident anti-communism, Japanese Communists refused to give it the right to call itself "a party of renewal". They opposed the idea of a "joint struggle of all opposition parties" put forward by the Socialist Party of Japan, which proposed the inclusion of the DSP in a united front, and refused to take part in any joint activity with the DSP.

The lack of clarity on fundamental principles whenever concrete problems need to be tackled has frequently led to splits within the DSP itself.

The theoretical weakness of its platform is also felt by the DSP leadership, which has set up a Society for the Study of Democratic Socialism. But such theoretical studies as have been produced by this society only serve to confirm the contradictions and lack of logic in the Japanese concept of "democratic socialism". Thus, on the eve of the opening of the 17th conference of the Society for the Study of Democratic Socialism in 1976, Seki Yoshihiko, Chairman of the Society, wrote an article in *Kaikakusha* (Reformist), the political organ of the DSP, devoted to a definition of the problems facing "democratic socialism" in the world today. Yoshihiko doubted the correctness of absolutizing the fundamental principles on which this concept is formed. He noted that in the "free democratic states", i. e., the European capitalist countries, the problem of "democracy's capability of governing society" had arisen. What is claimed to be of paramount importance attached to the rights of the individual was, according to Yoshihiko, weakening what he called the "spirit of the community" and engendering a point of

view which saw personal life as the panacea for all evils. "It not only weakens society's ability to withstand pressure from without, but leads to the destruction of society from within. Thus the question arises as to whether democracy will last in the developed countries during the second half of the twentieth century." Like all social-democratic parties where the right Social Democrats hold the dominant positions, the DSP is considered as a "middle-of-the-road party", a "second conservative party". The DSP itself "claims that these negative epithets have come into popular use because of the political immaturity of the voting public and tendency of the Japanese people to judge everything in terms of black and white".¹

According to data published by the Socialist International, the DSP has a total membership of 60,000 (the SPJ has 36,000)². Closely connected with the DSP is the DOMEI (Japanese Confederation of Labour), the largest trade union in Japan, which represents industrial workers and wields considerable influence. In 1977 the DSP considerably increased its representation in parliament (the lower house).

In March 1976 the 20th Special Congress of the DSP was called to approve the party programme for the coming elections to the lower house. As shown by its position on the question of forming a government out of a united front of progressive forces, the DSP has now adopted an anti-communist stand. In its declarations against the conservative government, the DSP lays great stress on the need to oppose communism. Ikko Kasuga, one of the leaders of the party, declared that the DSP sees its mission as the "defence of freedom and democracy against communism".

In April 1978 the 23rd Congress of the DSP took place. It revised the policy for a "united front of reformist forces" (meaning the DSP, the SPJ and the Komeito³) and adopted a new policy for "uniting responsible opposition parties" (the DSP, Komeito and the New Liberal Club⁴). According to this, the left opposition parties, CPJ and SPJ, were defined as being "irresponsible". The DSP's further swing to the right is also reflected in the Party's position on the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party, for the DSP leadership is even ready to enter into a coalition government with LDP, if the latter should so wish.

¹ *Journal of Social and Political Ideas in Japan*, No. 3, 1964, p. 63.

² *Socialist Affairs*, Vol. XXV, No. 6, 1975, p. 106.

³ The Komeito, a party of "pure politics" formed in November 1964 by the followers of the Buddhist organization Soka Gakkai.

⁴ The New Liberal Club, one of the "middle-of-the-road" parties, formed in June 1970 as a break-away from the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party.

All this shows that the concept of "democratic socialism" in Japan is worked out by the same forces as proclaim anti-communism and anti-Sovietism and who come out openly in support of the capitalist system and try to get the Japanese working class to do so too.

4. African "Democratic Socialism"—Attempts at Ideological Penetration in the Developing Countries

The strengthening of the socialist community, the growth of its influence on the international arena and the successful implementation of the policy of detente have favoured the struggle for social progress, against the attempts of the forces of imperialism and internal reaction to shore up their weakening positions.

During the course of the joint anti-imperialist struggle the national liberation movement has drawn closer to the two other leading forces of the present day—the world socialist system and the international working-class movement and this has provided the conditions for the formation of scientific views on socialism.

But the objective requirement of the peoples of the developing countries for the socialist path of social and economic development has also been realized by other ideological and political currents in the world, which are trying to spread their own influence in these countries and their own concepts of socialism. Most noteworthy among these currents is the international social-democratic movement and its leading organ—the Socialist International. The Socialist International, of course, knows that the concept of "democratic socialism" cannot by virtue of the specific nature of their development be accepted by these countries in the same form as it exists in the West, and so tries to find ideological means for penetrating the developing countries, which would not appear externally obtrusive, but which would nevertheless have the effect of drawing these countries into the social-democratic movement.

In the Frankfurt Declaration of 1951, the first programme document of the Socialist International after the war, the social-democratic movement externally disassociated itself from the colonialist policies of the imperialist powers. The document stated: "In recent years the peoples in the underdeveloped areas of the world have been finding Socialism a valuable aid in the struggle for national freedom and higher standards of life. Here different forms of democratic Socialism are evolving under the pressure of different circumstances. The main enemies of Socialism in these areas are parasitical exploitation by indigenous financial

oligarchies and colonial exploitation by foreign capitalists."¹

But these words diverged sharply with the specific deeds of the social-democratic parties, particularly those in power in the West European countries. Bound by treaties and other agreements with other imperialist states, these countries ended up by being forced to pursue just the same neocolonialist policies. For the people of the developing countries these circumstances could not pass unnoticed and they well remember that it is the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries that have been bringing help to the national liberation struggle, and not the imperialist states, whose policies were partly determined by the social-democratic movement.

In recent years social democracy has been trying to remedy this situation and correct the negative impression it produced on the peoples of the developing countries that it was playing a double game with them and the colonialists.

The leaders of the Socialist International have been trying to reconcile the differences of opinion that have sprung up between the West European social-democratic parties and the social-democratic parties in the developing countries. And with this end in view a number of international meetings have been held over the past few years, including the Socialist International Conference in Caracas (May 1976) which was attended by representatives from Western Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean countries, the Conference of Socialist International Party Leaders in Tokyo (December 1977) and the meeting of the Socialist International Bureau in Dakar (May 1978).

The problem of the Third World was given great attention at the 13th Congress of the Socialist International, which took place in October 1976. The resolutions adopted at the Congress (particularly those on Latin America and the new world economic order) show that international social democracy is trying to find its own solution to the problems facing the developing countries and on the basis of this draw them to social-democratic ideology.

At its 14th congress (Vancouver, Canada, November 1978) the Socialist International went even further by calling for a renunciation of "Eurocentrism" and greater concentration on the problems of other continents.

From the end of the sixties onwards the Socialist International has given greater and greater attention to developing relations with the Arab world, both in the Middle East and Northern Africa. The immediate cause for the galvanization of these relations has been

the crisis in the Middle East, but no less important a role has been played by the desire to instil the ideology of the Socialist International into the ruling parties of the leading Arab countries.

Events have moved in such a way that the Socialist International has taken a number of steps in this region aimed at ousting Marxist-Leninist ideology and strengthening the reformist currents among the most influential parties in the Arab states.

The Arab-Israeli conflict has openly revealed the lack of objectivity and blatantly pro-Israeli stance of the majority of the Socialist International parties, which has been also helped by the fact that the Workers' Party of Israel is also a member of the Socialist International and that this party was headed by the influential Golda Meir. The USSR and other socialist countries and the whole of progressive mankind have given all-round support to the Arab people in their struggle against Israeli aggression, which has been stage-managed by the most reactionary imperialist forces in the West. These circumstances have objectively put the leading parties of the Socialist International on a par with those who have done everything in their power to thwart the just cause of the Arabs. When the Arab peoples began to offer stronger resistance to imperialist aggression, voices began to be heard in the Socialist International calling for a reorientation of policy on the Middle East crisis.

As early as 1961 Bruno Kreisky, Chairman of the Socialist Party of Austria, suggested organizing a special mission from the Socialist International to the Arab countries. One of the main aims of this mission was to establish and expand contacts with the ruling parties in the Arab states so as to increase the social-democratic ideological influence over the Arab world.

This was demonstrated by the review of the situation in the Middle East given at the 13th Socialist International congress in 1976. The suggestion was made that the Socialist International should come out in support for the Palestine Liberation Organization and its participation on future talks for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. However, the organizing committee under clear pressure from the Israel Labour Party, refused to put this suggestion to the vote. That section of the political resolution adopted at the Congress which relates to the Middle East reflects the Israeli point of view in refusing to recognize the PLO as the legal representative of the Palestinian people and an equal partner at the negotiations.

In thus making definite concessions to the demands of the Israeli delegation, the Socialist International announced that it

¹ *Declarations of the Socialist International*, p. 3.

"recognizes and respects the rights of all peoples to self-determination". This formula was seen as a concession to those social-democratic circles which do recognize the PLO and support the creation of a Palestinian state.

The specific conditions of the African continent determine Socialist International tactics with regard to this region.

The heterogeneous composition of the leadership of the national liberation movement in Africa, the inclination to petty-bourgeois attitudes and concepts and certain leanings towards anti-communism as the result of Western capitalist propaganda have conditioned the soil for the spread of social reformist ideas among part of the leadership of the liberation movements.

The most noticeable initiative by the Socialist International was made in 1961 when representatives from various African countries were invited to its 7th Congress for the first time. The document adopted at the Congress, entitled "The New Countries and the New Generation for Socialism", contained an attempt to work out a programme for economic cooperation with these countries.

In 1962 a special Socialist International mission was sent to Africa whose aim was to gather information and form contacts which would give the Socialist International "a better understanding of political, social and economic developments and attitudes in Africa".¹

The Socialist International has made a fairly detailed analysis of the relationship between the concept of "democratic socialism" and African socialism. This matter was the subject of a discussion organized in 1960 by *Socialist International Information* (now called *Socialist Affairs*), the official organ of the Socialist International.

The paper entitled "Three Views on Africa", which was prepared by the British Labour, the French Socialists and the West German Social Democrats, spoke of the African community as a favourable basis for "democratic socialism", the similarity between African and European "democratic socialism" and the unacceptability of Soviet experience. "Africa," it stated, "will no doubt be led to promote a synthesis between the Chinese methods of development, the flexible economic planning of India and the Israeli humanism...."²

European social-democratic ideas have met with a favourable response from a number of party and government officials in Africa, who reject the socialist orientation and lay claim to the role

of ideologists of the "third way". The idea of broadening contacts between the African parties and the Socialist International has been actively supported by Gaëtan Duval, the Mauritius Socialist, President Senghor of Senegal, President Bourguiba of Tunisia and President Tsiranana of the Malagasy Republic. Their presence in the vanguard of the pro-Socialist International movement is not surprising. Their own outlooks and social and political sympathies were formed under the influence of French bourgeois culture. Léopold Senghor, who first used the highly controversial social and ethical concept of "negritude", though condemning the vices of the capitalist West, has never gone far in his criticism of imperialism. Essentially he has always been in favour of "putting capitalism right".

At the basis of Senghor's concept lies the idea of the inacceptability of a scientific class analysis of African reality, insofar as the "exclusiveness" of the "African individual" and the historical destinies of the African communities make them not susceptible to general historical laws. African socialism denies the class division of society, ascribing to African society an inherent socialist character. Thus it rejects the class struggle and the leading role of the working class and its party in the building of socialism and turns to the peasantry as the chief subject and object of "socialist" reconstruction.

The transition to socialism, according to Senghor, ought to be accomplished by what he calls the "middle way", which is opposed to both capitalism and communism and is supposed to be a non-Marxist alternative to capitalist development.

In practice, however, Senghor's "middle way" amounts to a form of capitalism that is decked out in socialist phraseology and based on state control of a mixed economy, which leaves private foreign and national capital untouched.

Whereas in the early sixties the theoreticians of African "democratic socialism" laid stress on "socializing" the economy, Senghor in his latest works interprets socialism as a form of participation based on major joint-stock companies and cooperatives of traders and industrialists. Thus the theoretical justification is given for compromise and cooperation with neocolonialism as well as for a policy of encouraging national capitalist elements.

The specific characteristics of African "democratic socialism" are particularly shown in the way it approaches political problems. As distinct from the political pluralism of the European Social Democrats Senghor and a number of other African leaders favour "a one-party system with guaranteed democratic freedoms"

¹ *Socialist International Information*, London, No. 2, 1962, p. 16.

² *Socialist International Information*, London, No. 46-47, 1960, pp. 677-79.

believing that this form of political organization is most suited to Africa.

Thus we see that the African version of "democratic socialism" is just a variety of national reformism, which openly opposes scientific socialism and has an anti-communist orientation.

Essentially it is an ideology of the national bourgeoisie which is formed during period of the increasing popularity of socialist ideas. Being one of the far-sighted leaders of the African bourgeoisie, Senghor renounces overtly bourgeois slogans, taking rather the slogans of right-wing social democracy and altering them to suit his taste.

The ideological kinship with Western social reformism has predetermined the establishment of closer relations between the proponents of African "democratic socialism" and West European social democracy. The opportunities for cooperation were discussed during Senghor's visits to France, Austria and Finland in 1973. While in France Senghor declared his intention of setting up a bureau of African socialist parties which would hold talks with the Socialist International.¹ The African leaders who favoured "improving" capitalism were driven to this by fear of the growing anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist moods of the African people, who were discontented with their position. Among the local bourgeoisie, particularly the bureaucracy, who were satisfied with the level of independence they possessed, comprador attitudes strengthened. The unstable social base in the country has compelled its leaders to look for allies outside. But the main argument in favour of joining the Socialist International was the intensified class and ideological struggle throughout the African continent. The increasing strength of the adherents of a socialist orientation, the successes of the African states that had chosen the non-capitalist path of development and the active and fruitful expansion of multilateral agreements between Africa and the socialist countries were undermining the positions of the social-democratic leaders, who stopped halfway in their criticism of colonialism and imperialism. The fall of the socialist parties from power in the Malagasy Republic and Mauritius was a great blow to the morale of social reformism in Africa. Since then other social reformist regimes in Africa have been isolated. The moral prestige of those consistent fighters for genuine independence in Africa, the revolutionary democrats who put forward the idea of socialist orientation, was being felt more and more.

¹ *Le monde*, March 24, 1973.

In conclusion we can say that by the early 1970s it became fairly clear that social democracy in Africa was holding very weak positions. However, recent events (the holding of the Socialist International Bureau in Dakar, Senegal, in May 1978, the renaming of the Progressive Union of Senegal—now Socialist Party of Senegal, the election of Senghor¹ as one of the vice-chairmen of the Socialist International and finally the declared intention of setting up a confederation of African social-democratic parties) have shown that social democracy in Africa is far from dead.

Nevertheless, it is evidently too early to speak of a definite African version of the concept of "democratic socialism". But amid the hotch-potch of numerous non-Marxist theories of socialism, the concept is beginning to acquire more or less definite characteristics.

This concept of "democratic socialism" is opposed by many African politicians who hold to a Marxist understanding of socialism. According to Amath Dansoko, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the African Independence Party of Senegal, "No plans or manoeuvres, however ingenious and whoever their authors and executors, can stop the objective and logical movement of the African peoples to final liberation. Only scientific socialism can show the shortest route to this goal."²

5. "Democratic Socialism" in Latin America

In recent years the Socialist International has shown noticeable activity in Latin America. One manifestation of this was the conference held in Caracas in May 1976 by the Socialist International, which was attended by representatives of 24 socialist, social-democratic and kindred parties from 22 countries in Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean.

The conference, which represented a major development in relations between the Socialist International and the countries of Latin America was attended by such prominent figures in the Socialist International as Willy Brandt, Bruno Kreisky, Mário Soares and Anker Jorgensen. It was called on the initiative of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and the Democratic Action Party of Venezuela.

At the conference the leadership of the West European social-

¹ At the 13th Congress of the Socialist International in 1976 Senghor delivered the main report on the question of a new economic world order.

² *World Marxist Review*, No. 12, 1975, p. 29.

democratic parties came under sharp criticism. Dudley Thompson, Jamaican Minister of Foreign Affairs, cast doubt on the solidarity of the European social-democratic parties with the developing countries. He declared that the West European Social Democrats exported anything to the poor countries except socialism.¹ Bruno Kreisky was forced to admit the same, when he noted that social-democratic philosophy had to a considerable extent lost its attractiveness for the oppressed peoples of the world.

Criticism from the Latin American countries was, to a certain extent, given recognition in the final document of the conference, which stated that the participants "condemn the fascist and totalitarian regimes that exist on the American continent". It was also stated that "there is no universal solution for the achievement of full democracy. Each country and each region of the world must find its own path to freedom and social justice according to the prevailing realities and on the basis of growing international solidarity".

One of the main signs of the influence of social democracy in the reformist Latin American political parties and movements is their understanding of the concept of "democratic socialism" and the "third way" as interpreted by the ideologists of the Socialist International. Under conditions of the intensifying ideological conflict between the two social systems, socialism and capitalism, the Socialist International ideologists together with the leaders of the social-democratic Latin American parties are speaking about the necessity of a "third way", which differs from both existing socialism and capitalism. But as distinct from the thirties and forties, when adherence to a "third way" was declared by the reformist parties to be necessitated by the "specific conditions" of the Latin American continent, today the "third way" policy is increasingly appearing in the form of social democracy. Recently adopted manifestos of the Latin American reformist parties are full of the ideas of social democracy. The manifestos of the Democratic Left Party of Ecuador and the Honduras Revolutionary Party,² for example, are written in this spirit, while the Ideological Charter of the Costa Rican Democratic Labour Confederation, which is under

the political control of the National Liberation Party, states that only within the framework of social democracy can the struggle of the working people for a just society be achieved. "Hence," the document states, "we are striving for social democracy both as an economic and social system."¹

In turning to social democracy, the Latin American parties have adopted the concept of "democratic socialism" and are trying to adapt it in the conditions in their own countries. Thus the Programme of the Honduras Revolutionary Party, for example, states: "Democratic socialism cannot be achieved other than by democracy, and democracy cannot be achieved without democratic socialism."²

But statements of this sort frequently conceal adherence to the capitalist system, which appears in varying degrees in different parties. Thus, one of the election manifestos of the People's National Party of Jamaica (1976) declared that the party supported a mixed economy as well as coexistence between and the harmonious combination of the public and the private sectors, which ought to act within the framework of the rules laid down in the name of balanced economic development.³ The ideologists of the Venezuelan and Costa Rican parties have even introduced such a concept as "humanistic capitalism", by which they mean a form of capitalism without that "unacceptable" face which it has possessed since the dawn of its formation in Europe.

One of the elements of the modernization and "humanization" of capitalism, in the opinion of the Latin American reformist ideologists, consists in giving the state the function of regulating social relations. According to the Ideological Charter of the Costa Rican Democratic Labour Confederation, "the state is an instrument in the service of society". Its activity should therefore be aimed at "preventing any disequilibrium that might result if certain groups become more privileged than others."⁴

The desire to show that in "democratic socialist" society the state is concerned with the welfare of all is a characteristic of all social democratic party documents. But at the same time these documents point out that in exercising its functions as an arbiter,

¹ Dudley Thompson, "Una ultima oportunidad para el socialismo democrático?" In: *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 24, 1976, pp. 19-22.

² "Declaración de Principios de la Izquierda Democrática de Ecuador". In: *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 28, 1977, pp. 151-56; "Declaración de Principios del Partido Revolucionario Hondureño". In: *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 33, 1977, pp. 182-92.

¹ "Carta Ideológica de la Confederación Costarricense de Trabajadores Democráticos". In: *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 26, 1976, p. 165.

² *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 33, 1977, p. 182.

³ See "People's National Party de Jamaica: los Proximos Cinco Años". In: *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 28, 1977, p. 147.

⁴ *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 26, 1976, p. 165.

the state is entitled to make its own demands on the various social strata. Addressing the entrepreneurs, President Carlos Andrés Pérez of Venezuela stressed that capitalization ought not to mean a growth in the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few and that economic targets must be seen in the light of social desirability.¹ Thus there can be no doubt that the ideas of social and class harmony and the necessity for the achievement of peaceful relations between exploiters and exploited, which have become part of the arsenal of the Latin American social reformist parties, are echoed in the conceptual framework of West European social democracy.

The similarity of viewpoints on such fundamental questions as the attitude to capitalism and existing socialism and to revolution and reform, the role and function of the state and the attitude to democracy have in their turn predetermined the organizational resemblance between the social-democratic parties of Western Europe and those of Latin America.

These tendencies have appeared in the foreign policies of the Latin American social-democratic parties. The ideas of these parties on foreign policy represent a peculiar symbiosis of the social-democratic approach and the ideological viewpoints of many Third World countries. Both of these are interwoven and reflected in their foreign policy both theoretically and practically.

The turn away from the cold war towards detente, which became possible thanks to the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries has been approved by leading circles in the Latin American social-democratic parties. According to President Pérez of Venezuela detente has favoured the formation of an independent foreign policy in the smaller countries, which can now play a positive role alongside the great powers in this process and make a significant contribution to the strengthening of detente and its expansion into the most diverse spheres. "We give our determined support, declared President Pérez, "to efforts aimed at deepening detente. The Helsinki Conference bore positive witness to a process which must be continually strengthened so it may lead to the taking of increasingly more constructive decisions."²

The extensive possibilities opened by detente have been utilized to a great extent by the governments of Costa Rica, Venezuela, Jamaica, Mexico and other Latin American countries. Contacts

have been broadened with the socialist countries. During President Pérez' term of office (1974-1978), for example, diplomatic relations were established with the GDR, Bulgaria, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and contacts widened with Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania and other socialist countries. In 1975 an agreement was signed between Venezuela and the Soviet Union on cultural and scientific cooperation.¹ In November 1976 an official visit of the President of Venezuela to the Soviet Union took place, the first in the history of Soviet-Venezuelan relations. During his visit Carlos Andrés Pérez expressed his tremendous appreciation for the successes achieved by the Soviet Union in economic and cultural development and noted that "the Soviet experience can become invaluable for strengthening the independent development of Venezuela".²

Links between the USSR and other Latin American countries, which are ruled by social-democratic parties have also increased over recent years. Thus, in May 1978, President José Lopez Portillo of Mexico visited the Soviet Union as did Prime Minister Michael Manley of Jamaica in April 1979.

Evidence of the readiness to be governed by the principles of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems as applied to Latin American conditions can be seen in the position of the ruling social-democratic parties vis-à-vis Cuba. For many years now the Institutional Revolutionary Party, which has been in power in Mexico, has held to this principle. Despite the pressures of US imperialism Mexico expands political and economic contacts with Socialist Cuba. In late 1974 diplomatic relations were restored between Venezuela and Cuba, which had been broken off in 1961 by the Democratic Action government. Friendly relations now exist between Jamaica and Cuba, since the People's National Party came to power in the former country.

The policies pursued by the Latin American social-democratic parties are based on the concept of continental solidarity and have a clearly marked nationalistic character. This tendency has appeared most clearly in the foreign policies of the ruling parties in Mexico and Venezuela (until 1979). The governments of both these countries have adopted policies of political and economic integration, which they see as one of the means of weakening their dependence on the US monopolies and the transatlantic corporations. The practical embodiment of this policy was the

¹ *El Universal*, July 2, 1974.

² *Pravda*, February 25, 1976.

¹ *Latinskaya Amerika*, No. 3, 1976, p. 139.

² *Pravda*, February 25, 1976.

setting up in 1975 on the initiative of Mexico and Venezuela of the Latin American Economic System, which is a new regional organization (without US participation) designed to protect economic interests of the Latin American countries and promote economic cooperation between them.

The social-democratic parties have also made a contribution to the struggle against fascism and the danger of fascism which hangs over Latin America. All parties participate actively in the campaign for international solidarity with the Chilean democrats, many of whom have been given political asylum in Venezuela, Mexico and Costa Rica. After the fascist military coup in Chile on September 11, 1973 Mexico broke off diplomatic relations with the Pinochet regime.

At the same time the Latin American social-democratic parties have their own particular approach to international relations, which is primarily expressed in their conception of the role of the Third World. The changes that have taken place in the world as a result of the shifting balance of power in favour of socialism and the concomitant weakness of capitalism have not been sufficiently understood by their ideologists and this is reflected in their theoretical propositions. The result is misrepresentation of the basic contradiction of our day. In the eyes of the Latin American social-democratic ideologists it appears not as a contradiction between the two opposing systems but as a contradiction between the poorly developed and the industrialized countries. Thus they virtually equate the highly developed capitalist countries, which enriched themselves by exploiting the natural and human resources in the Asian, African and Latin American countries, with the socialist countries, which can share none of the responsibility for it.

It is precisely for these reasons that the leaders of the Latin American parties began in the late sixties and early seventies to turn to the Third World and ended up including as part of their ideology the well-known supra-class theories of society with particular stress on the concept of the so-called rich and poor nations.¹

But while the majority of Asian and African theoreticians see this concept in a clearly ideological light stressing the distinctive features of the Third World and its radical difference from both the socialist and capitalist countries, many of the Latin American social-democratic parties look upon both the concept of the Third World

and the struggle led under its aegis as a means to a definite end which consists in wresting their own countries away from the majority of developing countries and making them equal partners with the developed capitalist states. This idea was stated by President Pérez at the Caracas Conference in 1976 in the following way: "In Latin America Europe has a valid intermediary, which can be a bridge to the Third World."¹

The Socialist International in its turn supports this line, as is shown by the sharp increase of interest it has displayed in the Latin American continent in recent years. Thus after its 13th Congress a Latin American Bureau was set up and at the 13th and 14th congresses special resolutions were passed on Latin America, Daniel Oduber, the Costa Rican representative, was elected vice-president of the Socialist International and a number of new Latin American parties were given membership.

Under conditions of the contention between the two social systems and the increasing influence of world socialism on the developing countries, many of which reject the capitalist path as leading to exploitation and dependence, the Socialist International has offered the Latin American peoples its own alternative in the form of "democratic socialism". But this policy only leads to modernizing Latin American capitalism by means of partial reforms and bringing it to the level of West European capitalism, thereby ensuring that Latin America remains within the framework of the capitalist system. If this does not happen, say the Socialist International ideologists, if capitalism in Latin America is not modernised and "humanized", then there will be a violent political explosion resulting in Latin America taking the road to socialism.

The leaders of the Socialist International do all they can to encourage anti-communism which is inherent in the Latin American social-democratic parties. Until the mid-1960s there was a characteristic tendency among the leadership of these parties to set their own parties in opposition to the political parties and groups that stood for unity among democratic forces in the struggle with imperialism and internal reaction. Today the parties still retain their anti-communism, but under the influence of the changes that have taken place in the world they adopt a somewhat different approach to the matter. Anti-communist propaganda has become more veiled and less blatant.

¹ Cf. J. Figueréz, *La Pobreza de las Naciones*, San José, 1973, pp. 43-77.

¹ C. A. Pérez, "Hacia la auténtica liberación del Hombre Universal". In: *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 24, 1976, p. 17.

The attitudes towards relations with the Communists were expressed in the most distinctive form at the conference in Caracas in April 1977. This conference made the recommendation that parties should base themselves on the concrete historical situation and correlation of political and class forces obtaining in their individual countries and then come to an independent decision as to whether to make contact with the Communists, enter into any temporary agreements with them or conclude broader alliances or coalitions. Apparently such recommendations are made part of the general context of Socialist International policy, and this line of thinking tends to be pursued in the political practice of the Latin American parties with varying degrees of modification.

Latin American Communists are positive in their evaluation of the changes that have taken place in the reformist parties. They show their solidarity with all moves directed towards controlling natural resources which over the course of many decades have been subjected to rapacious plunder and exploitation by the imperialist powers. This was given particular mention in the Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean, which took place in June 1975 in Havana, and has been echoed by numerous communist party leaders. Thus, for example, Jesus Faria, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Venezuela, in defining the position of Latin American Communists, declared: "We always support the government unhesitatingly when it comes to defending the national interests of the country from the encroachments of imperialism and countering its policy of pressure and intimidation."¹

All this shows that the prerequisites exist for dialogue and joint action between Communists and Social Democrats both at the national and the regional level on such questions as the defence of natural resources from rapacious exploitation by the multinational corporations, disarmament, detente, the defence of democracy and democratic institutions and the struggle against fascism and the threat of fascism.

The social-democratic parties in Latin America today are undergoing a complex process. Though they borrow the concept of "democratic socialism" from the European Social Democrats, the various parties and factions interpret it differently with some adopting a right-centrist approach (the Venezuelan Democratic

Action Party), others a Zionist interpretation (the Costa Rican National Liberation Party), and others still a left-wing stand (the People's National Party of Jamaica) with the result that many of the basic postulates of this concept are called into question. In November 1978 Anselmo Sule, the Chilean representative to the 14th Congress of the Socialist International, declared that his party was working for the creation of a socialist Latin America. But when clarifying the main features of this plan he pointed to state control of the economy, social and economic equality, the active participation of the trade unions and the intelligentsia in government, and the setting up of worker participation in management. In other words, he was outlining the programme of the left wing of the social-democratic movement.

Speaking in Moscow during his official visit to the Soviet Union Prime Minister Michael Manley of Jamaica said that under the leadership of the Party the Jamaican people were setting about the solution of the most urgent national-democratic tasks. Having firmly chosen the non-capitalist path of development the Jamaican people began taking control over the country's economy. They established firm control over the natural resources, began developing both the state and the cooperative sectors, and instituted a radical agrarian reform programme.¹

The document of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean turns its attention to the left swing in a number of reformist parties and states that "the nationalists can be brought round to adopt anti-imperialist and revolutionary positions".²

6. The Zionist Variety of "Democratic Socialism"

One of the most reactionary varieties of "democratic socialism" is the so-called socialist Zionism, which first appeared on the scene at the end of the last century.

Quite soon after the founding of the World Zionist Organization in 1897, some of its members started bending over backwards to hide the actual class nature of Zionism with "socialist"

¹ *Pravda*, April 11, 1979.

² "Latin America in the Struggle Against Imperialism, for National Independence, Democracy, People's Welfare, Peace and Socialism". In: *Information Bulletin*. Published by Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, No. 12-13. 1975, p. 43.

¹ *Our Friends Speak. Greetings to the 25th CPSU Congress*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1976, p. 84.

phraseology. By doing so they hoped to steer working-class Jews away from the revolutionary movement and draw them into the ranks of the Zionist organizations.

In declaring themselves "socialists" and "defenders of the interests of the proletariat", the "left" Zionist leaders aimed not only at widening the base of the Zionist movement, but also at winning allies, in the shape of the working-class and trade union movement in Europe and America and the social-democratic parties and leaders of the Second International. Zionism evolved its own "working-class" ideology. Characteristically, all the basic propositions of the ideologists of social-Zionism were borrowed (sometimes with certain modifications) from the bourgeois Zionists. As for the activities of the Zionist "socialist" parties, with some very rare exceptions (mainly occurring during the first stage of social-Zionism) they always stuck to the line of "national unity" and a "common destiny" with the bourgeoisie.

The totally unscientific nationalistic thesis regarding the special path of development assigned to the Jewish working class quickly brought the adepts of Zionist "socialism" into the camp of reaction and counter-revolution. After the Great October Socialist Revolution the Zionist "socialist" parties along with the openly bourgeois Jewish parties actively participated in the campaign of the united forces of the counter-revolution and foreign intervention against the young Soviet state.

From 1933 the community of Jewish settlers in Palestine (Yishuv) was virtually ruled by the Zionist social reformist party MAPAI, or Eretz Yisrael (Party of the Workers of the Land of Israel).¹ After the foundation of the Israeli state MAPAI (later MAI²) remained until the summer of 1977 the main party of the government coalition.

MAPAM (the United Workers' Party), which for a number of years has been a left-wing Zionist party, enjoyed and still enjoys a certain amount of influence in Israel.

Since the formation of the Israeli state in 1948, and particularly after the aggressive wars unleashed by Israeli ruling circles, the process of the gradual sliding to the right of the social-Zionist parties has gone so far that it is now extremely difficult and sometimes

¹ *Eretz Yisrael*—the Hebrew name for the whole territory of Palestine. Thus the very name of MAPAI suggests its anti-Arab, chauvinistic character.

² MAI (the Israel Labour Party) was founded in January 1968, which saw the merging of two related parties—MAPAI and Achdut Ha'avoda. The latter should not be confused with a party of the same name that existed in Palestine in 1919-1930, and the even more rightist grouping RAFI (the Israel Labour List).

almost impossible to draw a line between the Zionist bourgeois and the "workers' " parties.

The ideological platform of MAPAI-MAI is a wildly eclectic mixture of postulates and theses drawn from various pseudo-socialist and also some fashionable bourgeois doctrines. When discussing the theoretical foundations of contemporary Zionist "socialism" the leaders of this party do all they can to mask the reactionary essence of their ideology.

In actual fact the social-Zionists fully subscribe to all the general Zionist dogmas: existence of an extra-territorial "worldwide Jewish nation", "perpetuity of anti-semitism", possibility and necessity of solving the "Jewish question" only through the "return" of the Jews to the "land of their ancestors", and so on.

Like all other Zionists, the social-Zionists flatly deny the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and establishment, alongside the State of Israel, of their own national state, as envisaged in the well-known resolutions passed by the United Nations. They often try to camouflage their anti-Arab chauvinism and racialism with various grandiloquent phrases and pharisaically present themselves as internationalists. But no amount of camouflage or demagoguery can hide the essentially chauvinistic and racist attitude of social-Zionism towards the Arabs.

To what depths of hypocrisy and sacrilege must one sink to declare the chauvinistic, racist policy of de-Arabization of Palestine, and later Israel ("more land, less Arabs") combined with the extreme right-wing variant of the social reformist policy of "class collaboration", compatible with socialism and even capable of laying the foundation for a socialist society!

At the same time the social-Zionists demagogically allege that Zionism was the first to combine socialism with national liberation and advocate an alliance of these forces.¹

The Zionist racist policy has created the tragic problem of the Palestinian refugees (now numbering some three million) and constant national discrimination against the 500,000 Arabs living in Israel, who are deprived of all rights and often the very means of existence.²

¹ See: David M. Zohar, *Political Parties in Israel*, Praeger Publishers, New York, Washington, London, 1974, p. 38.

² Sh. Toledano, a former adviser on Arab affairs to three successive Israeli prime ministers, stated in January 1977 that "the position of the Arab-national minority in Israel is the worst in the world". (See supplement to the newspaper *Haaretz*, January 28, 1977).

One of the basic tenets of the ideology and policy of social-Zionism, as of all Zionism, has always been the cult of force, reliance on militarism and aggression.

Like other Zionists, the leaders of the MAI and MAPAM advertise Zionism as a "Jewish revolution" and declare Israel to be "the realization of the Zionist idea", a "special state", the "homeland of all Jews". They actively champion the theory of "dual loyalty" (or "dual citizenship") of Jews, which is in fact a blatant violation of the generally accepted rules of international law.

Many social-Zionists subscribe to the ethnocentrist, racist thesis of Zionism that the Jews are "God's chosen people" and particularly that of the "special destiny of Israel", although they are usually careful to cover up their allegiance to these ideas.

Like the openly bourgeois Zionists, the social-Zionists parasitize on anti-semitism and even sometimes artificially incite it. They have collaborated and are still collaborating on the common platform of anti-communism with die-hard anti-semites.

One of the basic elements of MAI ideology is so-called religious (or prophetic) socialism (Old Testament prophetism).

The social-Zionists (like all the other trends in Zionism) need Judaism¹ to build up the fiction of a "united Jewish nation" because they see that the elements of "national unity" they have invented, such as the "spirit of Jewry handed on from generation to generation", the "natural attraction of Zion", the myth of the "perpetuity of anti-semitism", and so on, are not strong enough to give them control of the Jewish communities of various countries.

Synthesizing Zionism and Judaism, the social-Zionists declare the kibbutz to be the ideal social and state system. The kibbutzes are mostly militarized cooperative-communal agricultural settlements, whose members usually own only articles of personal use. The kibbutzes are totally dependent on capitalist banks, credit funds and private firms, which exploit both the ordinary members of the kibbutz and the kibbutzes taken as an organized whole. Lately the kibbutzes have to an ever greater extent been hiring outside labour, mainly among the Arabs, and thus acting as collective exploiters of hired labour. In Israel today the kibbutzes are an effective form for obtaining cheap labour and a convenient instrument for training young people and new immigrants in the Zionist spirit. Without any real grounds, for purely propagandistic purposes they are also widely called "primary cells of socialism".

¹ "Today Zionism and the State of Israel must recreate Judaism," wrote Yigal Allon, a social-Zionist and former Deputy Prime Minister (*The Jerusalem Post*, May 29, 1969).

Trade unionism and various types of "cooperative" or "guild" socialism have had a considerable influence on the theoretical guidelines and practical activities of the leaders of the social-Zionist parties. These are simply varieties of bourgeois-reformist socialism, slightly modified to serve right-wing social democracy.

The trade union-cooperative sector of the economy set up in Israel on the basis of the cooperative movement very soon became not only an apparatus for financing and strengthening the social-Zionist parties and organizations and the working-class aristocracy, but also a source of enormous profits for the bourgeoisie.

The business activity of the Israeli cooperatives differs in no way from the economic activity of the bourgeois state and the private capitalist sector and exists side by side with the state sector as a base for the development of a state-capitalist structure in Israel. Unlike many young states of Asia and Africa, the Israeli cooperative movement has no anti-exploitative or anti-imperialist orientation. The so-called trade union sector in Israel is in fact a built-in component of the military-industrial complex.

Like the overtly bourgeois Zionists, the leaders of the Zionist "workers'" parties have always tried, and are trying particularly hard today, to spread among the working people the illusion of the "community of interests and destinies among Jewry", "class peace", "social harmony", and "collaboration between labour and capital".

By combining "democratic socialism" with the dogmas of Zionism in their social-Zionist, that is to say, even more carefully camouflaged interpretation, and Zionist demagoguery with right-wing social-democratic demagoguery, the MAI leaders systematically poison the class consciousness of the Israeli working people.

At present the leaders of MAI, which is formally in the parliamentary opposition, are criticizing the Likud government over certain foreign policy issues, but on the whole they maintain the reactionary postures of Zionism. This shows yet again what "democratic socialism" amounts to in its Zionist version.

Chapter III

"DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM" IN PRACTICE

1. The Contradiction Between Theory and Practice

The validity of a theory lies in its practice. It is therefore to the practice of the social-democratic parties that we must look for a criterion of the validity of their concept of "democratic socialism". The Social Democrats have been in power in a number of West European countries and therefore had considerable opportunity for putting into practice the measures that follow from their theoretical and political programmes and which, according to their phraseology, will bring about the gradual transformation of capitalism into socialism. What use have they made of these opportunities? Have the principles of "democratic socialism" brought about any changes in the foundations of the capitalist system?

Let us recall a few facts. For almost twenty years since the war the Labour Party has been in power in Britain (1945-1950, 1950-1951, 1964-1966, 1966-1970, 1974-1979). In West Germany the Social Democratic Party (with the support of the Free Democratic Party) has been in power since 1969. From 1945 to 1966 the Socialist Party of Austria formed a two-party coalition with the bourgeois Austrian People's Party and from 1970 to the present day has been in power alone. For almost half a century with a few short breaks the Labour Party has been in power in Norway. Social Democrats in Sweden recently lost the election after being in power for more than forty years. Social Democrats have frequently formed governments or entered into coalition governments in France, Italy, Denmark, Belgium, Holland and several other countries.

The social-democratic parties in many capitalist countries have had plenty of opportunity to put the ideas of "democratic socialism" into practice and demonstrate the road to socialism that

they have proclaimed as an alternative to communism. At this point it is worth keeping in mind that the truly revolutionary parties in history took no longer than one or two years to carry out radical social and political reforms of an irreversible nature, even when these parties (like, for example, the Jacobins) were forced to beat a hasty retreat from the political arena.

The Social Democrats, however, for all their time in power have not even attempted to make any radical changes to the political and economic structure of modern capitalism, a fact they themselves admit. Thus at a meeting with Bruno Kreisky and Willy Brandt in 1975 in which the current economic crisis that had hit the capitalist world was discussed Olof Palme stated: "We socialists to a certain degree live in a condition of symbiosis with the capitalism."¹

Whereas "democratic socialism" as the ideological programme of social democracy is essentially a renunciation of socialist change, the practice of the social-democratic governments goes much further in this direction. There is every reason to see a definite gap between the theory of "democratic socialism" on the one hand and its practice on the other, the latter having very little in common with the democratic and socialist phraseology which characterizes social reformist ideology.

This gap has been the subject of attention even of some of the adherents of "democratic socialism", particularly the left Social Democrats. The Austrian left-wing Social Democrats, who organized a faction of their own in 1975, stated in their programme declaration that contradictions between theory and practice have characterized social-democratic politics in recent years. Furthermore, certain right-wing social-democratic leaders have also admitted the existence of this gap and even tried to provide some explanation for it.

Olof Palme, reviewing the crisis that engulfed the capitalist world in the early seventies, suggested that this crisis demanded compromises from the Social Democrats and that these compromises might be understood "as betrayal of social-democratic ideals and retreat before powerful economic interests". However, it should also be remembered that the Social Democrats retreated just the same in economically favourable periods.

The authors of *Kritischer Rationalismus und Sozialdemokratie*

¹ W. Brandt, B. Kreisky, O. Palme, *Op. cit.*, p. 118.

² W. Brandt, B. Kreisky, O. Palme, *Op. cit.*, p. 97.

have not only noted the contradiction between "revolutionary" theory and "reformist" practice in "democratic socialism", but also said that this was no cause for embarrassment.

2. The Political Mechanism Remains Unchanged

Not one of the above mentioned social-democratic parties during the time it was in power made any significant reforms aimed at transforming the existing political system or changing the bourgeois state machinery and its political functions.

In point of fact, the only serious democratic move capable of having any real influence on the political situation was the electoral reform which was carried out by the social-democratic governments in Britain, Austria, West Germany and Sweden and involved lowering the voting age to 18 years (in Sweden to 19 years). As a result of the high birthrate during the first postwar decade, this reform had the effect of substantially increasing the size of the electorate in these countries.

Without denying the positive significance of these electoral reforms, it should nevertheless be emphasized that analogous reforms were carried out during the same period by bourgeois governments in a number of countries like, for example, the United States in 1970 where the 26th amendment to the Constitution also lowered the voting age to 18. In actual fact all these reforms were necessitated to a large degree by the intensification of activity among the youth movements and in a two-party system held no danger for the mechanism of political power. New voters were either split between the main parties or lost entirely, for in carrying out this reform of electoral rights the social-democratic governments left the anti-democratic features of the current electoral system completely untouched. The Labour Party in Britain resisted all demands for the introduction of proportional representation, while in West Germany the "five per cent rule" was retained. (This stipulation was adopted as a measure against the Communists in the fifties and states that any party receiving less than five per cent of the total number of votes cast at an election automatically loses the right to representation in parliament.)

A change of party at the helm of the bourgeois state is always accompanied by a "division of rewards", which is to say that the victorious party takes over the offices that were held by the party that lost the election. This system is widely used by the Social Democrats. But its essence consists in the fact that the change ta-

kes place only at ministerial level and is not accompanied by any real personnel or structural changes in the bourgeois state-bureaucratic machinery, including the police and the organs of repression, which for decades have served the bourgeoisie. This state apparatus, the civil service as it is known, has the real administrative power in the country and serves bourgeois and social-democratic governments equally and is equally strengthened by them.

This policy is one of the elements of what the English call the policy of concord that is to say agreed policy between the two main parties (Labour and Conservative) over a number of key issues. It ensures continuity in the work of the state apparatus, which implements a kind of midway policy that meets with the agreements of the leaders of both sides.

The new programme of the Socialist Party of Austria, adopted in 1978 (which, incidentally, instead of "democratic socialism" prefers the even vaguer concept of "social democracy") contains the demand to do away with "top-level bureaucracy", oppose bureaucratization and remove the gap between the population and the administration. In reading these demands one would be forgiven for thinking that they were being put forward by a party in opposition, not by a party that has been in power for seven years and has therefore had every available opportunity for radically democratizing the state structure, but nevertheless prefers to limit itself to good intentions set out in manifesto form.

The state apparatus in West Germany was set up during the period that the CDU/CSU coalition was in power and it is this that has determined its social composition, orientation and methods. Thousands of former nazi civil servants and functionaries and even former war criminals have found refuge in the West German state apparatus, whereas since 1951 it has been forbidden for Communists or members of progressive left-wing organizations to be employed there. While in opposition the Social Democrats frequently criticized the state apparatus as formed by the CDU. It would be thought that once in power they would be ready to take immediate steps towards its democratization. But no radical changes took place. Furthermore, the Federal Government upheld the decision which came into force in January 1972 banning members and supporters of "radical" organizations from working in the state institutions (including schools, higher education establishments, courts and various administrative bodies). The implementation of this decision shows that it has been used chiefly against Communists and other democratically-minded people. The

Berufsverbot has been applied against more than 2,000 civil servants who were dismissed from their posts. A further 700,000 underwent investigation as to their "loyalty to the Constitution". At the same time in various state departments neo-fascists from the NDP are freely employed.

Of course, social-democratic governments tend to have fewer direct protégés of the monopolies and big business, being formed largely of professional politicians, party and trade union functionaries, top civil servants and lawyers. But this only brings out the fact that for the monopolies it is not a question of whether the members of a particular government belong to the upper bourgeoisie, but rather—and this is of utmost importance—whether the government pursues a pro-monopoly policy. This shows the extent to which the social-democratic leadership has merged with the monopolists without actually joining them.

In this connection the German Communist Party made the correct observation at its congress in Düsseldorf that "change of government in the FRG has touched the relations of property and power that are characteristic of imperialism".

Of course, given the alternative of "bourgeois democracy or authoritarian reaction" the social-democratic position is in many respects preferable for the working people, which indeed explains the victories of social-democratic parties in the struggle for power over the leading bourgeois parties.

Social-democratic governments like a stable bourgeois democratic political system and consequently they are less inclined to authoritarianism than their political competitors, the main bourgeois parties. But at the same time the Social Democrats have taken no effective steps towards a genuine democratic restructuring of the political machinery of the monopolies so as to exclude the possibility of reactionary coups.

3. Has the Economic Infrastructure Changed?

When we look at the economic policies of the social-democratic governments, we find that not one has made use of its powers to even undermine, let alone abolish the dominant positions of monopoly capital. Such a goal does not even feature as part of the aims of the social-democratic governments, although, of course, they have had to take some measures to restrict the activities of individual monopolies. In this respect, however, they have done no more than the bourgeois governments.

The social-democratic political manifestos contain numerous declarations of intent to inflict crushing blows on capitalist ownership and the economic domination of the monopolies. But these in practice have turned out to be no more than state interference in economy of a kind to be expected under state-monopoly capitalism. In essence the economic foundations of "democratic socialism" amount to no more than state-monopoly capitalism. Whenever these governments do adopt more or less serious measures, such as for example nationalization, this is only on a scale necessary for the functioning of the state-monopoly system and never to such an extent that it would undermine the social and economic basis of monopoly domination.

Particularly significant in this connection is the attitude of the British Labour Party leadership to nationalization. Back in 1918 it declared its official support for the establishment of state control of the economy by means of nationalization (Paragraph IV of the Constitution). But it was not until the Attlee government (1945-1951) which was in power at the time of the formation of the state-monopoly system, that the most active steps towards nationalisation were carried out. In 1946 civil aviation was nationalized and this was followed by transport and power in 1948, the gas industry in 1949 and the iron-and-steel industry in 1951. The idea behind this nationalization was not the idea of radically transforming society through public ownership, but the belief that nationalization would bring about economic effectiveness and help to modernize the backward industries. The majority of these nationalization measures (with the exception of the nationalization of steel and, to some extent, transport) did not cause much opposition from the Conservatives.

During the fifties the right-wing Labour leadership moved away from nationalization towards a policy of "regulating the economy". In 1951 an attempt was made to repeal paragraph IV of the Constitution but it was unsuccessful as a result of fierce resistance from rank-and-file party members. Nationalization was retained as a principle of Labour Party policy, but the leadership's later declarations began to equate nationalization with state participation in joint-stock companies, the setting up of municipal enterprises and the development of cooperative ownership.

The Wilson government (1964-1970) significantly expanded the number of economic bodies engaged in programming and assisting the concentration of production and capital. However, these bodies had little real effect. Labour "planning" envisaged no measures for strengthening control over the private sector of the economy. It was

based on "voluntary cooperation" between the government and the industrialists with the latter having the final say. Insofar as such national planning was only a supplement to the market its implementation depended on the free play of market forces.

At the elections that took place in the 1970s (spring and autumn 1974 and May 1979) the Labour Party election manifestos spoke of the necessity to continue the policy of nationalization. The reason for this was, on the one hand, pressure from the left and, on the other, the fact that nationalization was one of the few points of principle on which the Labour and Conservative parties differed.

After coming to power again in 1974 the Labour government were quick to repeal some of the anti-working-class laws, such as for example the Industrial Relations Act, which had been passed by the Conservative government of Edward Heath. But there was never any question of real restructuring of the state-monopoly system during the subsequent five years of its term of office.

In the FRG the formation of the state-monopoly structure took place on the basis of the ideas of neo-liberalism, which, although it did not actually deny the importance of state-monopoly intervention in the economy, preferred indirect forms of such intervention.

The West German social-democratic government does not insist on nationalization and its period in power was not accompanied by any attempt to change the state-monopoly structure of the economy.

In his work which bears characteristic title *Zwischen Godesberg und Grossindustrie oder Wo steht die SPD?* (Between Godesberg and Big Business or What is the Position of the SPD), Emil Bandholz notes that the leadership of the Social Democratic Party of Germany seems to have few clear ideas on the socio-economic role of the state and has simply jumped on the opportunist bandwagon. Furthermore, he says, there has been a definite tendency to tailor the socio-political concepts of the social-democratic leadership to suit the interests of the major industrialists. This process, which is now quite far advanced, has had, according to Bandholz, the following results:

- the Social Democrats have renounced all the fundamental social and economic reforms, particularly those relating to private property;

- the fact that wage workers acquire property in production assets does not affect the creation of capital by the capitalist industry and its further investment in production. It is desirable only within such limits as would tend to soften unjust property distribution;

- income tax should not be raised;
- capital turnover is not subject to any limits;
- worker participation is only possible within certain limits.

In return the Social Democrats have received the following concessions:

- maintenance of full employment;
- the state budget is to finance the development of the infrastructure as other measures designed to improve the structure of the economy;
- all other social reforms—the health services, education, etc.—can be implemented as the overall economic situation dictates, but only after the requirements of industry have been met.¹

The politics of such a merger between social democracy and big business, concludes Bandholz, do not in any way threaten the positions of monopoly capital, but rather serve to strengthen them. By way of "compensation" to the other side to this "agreement"—the working class—the ruling social-democratic party offers the so-called accumulation of productive capital as well as the "right to participate in management". What this means in fact is that part of a worker's incomes (approximately 600 marks per year) are made free of tax and social insurance on the condition that this sum is invested in the enterprise at which the worker is employed. The funds thus collected are made into part of the capital of the enterprise and the whole system is supposed to mark the beginning of "people's capitalism" in the FRG. This system is now in operation at more than 300 factories.

This "workers' ownership" as it is called by the Social Democrats is in fact nothing more than an attempt to implement the notorious idea of "the cooperation between labour and capital".

As regards the "right to participate in management" the social-democratic approach is imbued with the spirit of social partnership. The law On the Status of the Enterprise which was passed in 1972 when the CDU were in power maintains the clear distinction in roles between the production council at an enterprise and the trade union organization, although it is the struggle against this that has been one of the most important tasks in the working-class movement since 1952. The law not only confirms the ban on any party-political work at enterprises, but even, in "extreme circumstances", provides for the exclusion of the trade union from the affairs of the enterprise.

¹ Emil Bandholz, *Zwischen Godesberg und Grossindustrie oder Wo steht die SPD?*, Rowohlt, Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1971, p. 107.

The real nature of the economic policy of the social-democratic governments can be seen from a statement by Gunnar Fredriksson, a well-known figure in the Swedish Social Democratic Labour Party who admitted that "social democracy today is trying to solve social problems by prescribing as the treatment for a variety of capitalist disorders a dose of even more capitalism".¹

4. Politics in the Sphere of Social Services

The main means by which the social-democratic leadership tries to appease the demands of its left wing for more radical, pro-socialist policies and win over the electorate, on whom the outcome of the next election depends, is the implementation of what is called its social services programme. This is aimed at slightly improving the economic condition of the public at large. It is therefore hardly surprising that the ideology of "democratic socialism" has of late attached great importance to the so-called quality of life.

Important social reforms were first introduced in Britain by the Labour government immediately after the war. In 1974, seeking a return to power, the Labour Party promised to conduct a further series of such reforms. But the scale of the strike movement in subsequent years was to show how far these electoral promises were from reality.

In 1970 the social-democratic government in the FRG published what it called an "Account of Social Problems" which formulated a number of the goals of social policy. These included, in particular, improving the "mobile" age limit for insurance in old age, introducing health insurance for peasants and a number of other measures. Earlier still promises were made to increase allowances to large families. The annual report of the West German government to the Bundestag on social problems mentions the measures already introduced: widening the scope of obligatory health insurance for all white-collar workers, improving aid to war victims, increasing the number of persons entitled to receive old age pensions and lowering the pensionable age in certain circumstances from 65 to 63 or 62. At the same time many promises have simply remained on paper.

During the 1970s a number of social measures were carried out by the right socialist government in Austria. These include free travel for schoolchildren on public transport and free provision of school textbooks, raising family allowances for newlyweds,

¹ *Tiden*, No. 1, 1973, p. 1.

increasing child allowances, giving newly married couples priority in housing and increasing full sick-pay benefits from two to four weeks.

The positive significance of the social concessions to the working people which the bourgeois state is forced to make when the Social Democrats are in power should not be underestimated. It must be stressed again and again, however, that a policy of social concessions is nothing more than a sacrifice of the unimportant for the sake of retaining the important, i. e., the capitalist system as such. It is a way of ironing out the class contradictions engendered by the system. Furthermore, it leaves the fundamental relationship between capital and labour untouched.

The real significance of these social concessions is always far less than it appears at first. They are to a considerable extent negated by spiralling inflation, rising prices, unemployment and a number of other economic and political factors, and present one of the vicious circles so characteristic of social-democratic strategy today. For the social needs of the working people to be fully guaranteed there has to be a radical transformation of the capitalist economic system, the instability, inflation, monetary and other crises of which completely undermine the real significance of social reform.

There has always been a considerable gap between the plans for social reform that are proclaimed in the electoral manifestos of the social-democratic parties and what the social-democratic governments actually carry out when in power.

The crisis of the 1970s which engulfed the capitalist world dealt a powerful blow to the spurious interpretation of the reformist social services policy.

The consequences of this crisis—the growth of unemployment and spiralling inflation—hit the working people hard. It showed above all that the increasing economic role of the bourgeois state was by no means such a panacea for the ills of capitalism as had been thought by reformist ideologists and politicians during the comparatively favourable period of the first postwar decades. The state-monopoly power mechanism and its main link—the widening functions of the state—was not only unable to prevent crisis from hitting the capitalist economy but was also buffeted itself by the effect of the crisis. "Promises to make capitalism 'sounder' and to create a 'welfare society' within its framework have obviously failed."¹

Thus to sum up, we can say that the policies of the social-demo-

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 34.

cratic governments and their political, economic and social measures have left untouched the foundations of the state-monopoly structure as it exists in the capitalist countries today based on an alliance between the power of monopolies and the state.

The work of the social-democratic parties in power only confirms the thesis that these parties are becoming increasingly integrated into the state-monopoly system.

It would of course be a simplification to suggest that the social-democratic parties have frequently come to power through the personal desires of the monopoly capitalists. In most cases this has been something forced upon them by the political situation and the electoral defeat of the main bourgeois parties. But, on the other hand, monopoly capital possesses sufficient resources for ensuring that the social-democratic governments pursue policies that are in accordance with its requirements. One such informal, though flexible and extremely effective resource, is the integration of the social-democratic leadership into bourgeois economic and political circles. It is not accidental that a characteristic feature of the social-democratic parties as compared with the bourgeois parties is the contradiction between the leadership of the party and the mass of its rank-and-file members, particularly the left wing. Furthermore, once the Social Democrats are in power this contradiction deepens and the political activity of the left increases. Hence the duality in the position of the social-democratic governments. Retaining the trust of the masses is difficult to accomplish without adopting measures that run counter to the interests of the monopolists. But should these measures appear to be of some significance and monopoly capital feel that its "flexible" influence on the social-democratic leadership is waning, then it takes more decisive steps to remove the Social Democrats from power. This undermines the economy, creating hardships, arousing general dissatisfaction and giving rise to political corruption and intrigue. Thus faced with the dilemma as to whether to take resolute steps against the monopolies or make concessions even to the point of resigning from office, the social-democratic government will always prefer the latter and it either allows the capitalist party to take over the government by itself, or, if it can, enters into a coalition with it. A typical example of this is Portugal, where after the parliamentary elections of 1976 the left parties could have formed a government capable of achieving all the basic aims of the Portuguese revolution. But the Socialists refused an alliance with the Communists and formed their own

government of "relative majority" (i. e., representing the largest group in parliament but not having an absolute majority). Failing to deepen and extend the democratic transformations that had started in the country, the Socialists, moreover, impeded them and within a year entered into coalition with one of the main right-wing bourgeois parties and were finally forced out of government altogether. The results of all this were that the democratic gains of the Portuguese people have been seriously threatened.

Chapter IV

THE GROUNDLESS SOCIAL REFORMIST FALSIFICATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATURE OF EXISTING SOCIALISM

1. The Fundamental Difference Between Socialist and Bourgeois Democracy

While the ideology and practice of social reformism is suffering one defeat after another, the theory and practice of scientific communism is gaining more and more victories.

The socialist countries have demonstrated the economic, social, cultural and political advantages of the new social system and these are becoming more apparent against the background of the deepening crisis of capitalism. The genuinely humane and deeply democratic nature of existing socialism is now fully evident and for this reason tremendous interest has been aroused among the working people in the capitalist countries towards the socialist countries, particularly the USSR, the country which saw the world's first victory for socialism and which has now built a developed socialist society. Developed socialism is the highest achievement of social progress the world has yet known.

The 1977 Constitution of the USSR contains a comprehensive testimonial to the achievements of mature socialism, shows the achievements of people's socialist democracy and the broad range of rights and freedoms enjoyed by Soviet citizens, and outlines the principles of the formation and functioning of the organs of state power.

The question of democracy has acquired particular importance today in the ideological struggle between Marxists-Leninists and social reformists. It is the focal point for the concentration of ideas on socialist society as a whole, not only on its political, but also on its economic, social and cultural foundations.

The theory and practice of scientific communism affirms that democracy, which under capitalism does not go beyond the juridical and political sphere, has acquired under socialism a comprehensive character and has been spread to all parts of social,

political, economic and cultural life. It has become, in the words of Lenin, a democracy "in practice, not on paper, but in life, not in political phrase-mongering, but in economic reality".¹

It is this above all that constitutes the cardinal difference between socialist democracy and the "democratic socialist" concept of democracy.

Existing socialism shows that the only possible economic foundation for genuine democracy is social ownership of the means of production, by virtue of which the working people (in a developed socialist society the whole people) become the sole masters of social wealth. This determines the decisive influence of the economic base on the social and political superstructure and conditions its genuine democratism. The radical difference between socialist and bourgeois democracy consists in the fact that socialist democracy implies the elimination of private ownership of the means of production and consequently the abolition of exploitation and the development of all members of society into free and equal workers.

The concept of social democracy held by the ideologists of "democratic socialism" glosses over the question of ownership and this ultimately implies the stability of private ownership.² Socialist ownership is usually opposed in the "democratic socialist" models to a "pluralist economy" supposed to be based on the principles of "self-government", which implies certain elements of planning combined with maintenance of the market system practically in the same form as it functions under capitalism. In their opinion active state participation in managing the economy acts as a brake on the democratization of the socialist economic system and precludes any development of managerial activity by the staffs of enterprises.

In the interaction between economy and democracy Marxism-Leninism sees both the dependence of democracy on the socio-economic nature of socialism and its reverse influence on economy. In fact not any form of state ownership can be socialist. It only becomes socialist ownership when there is a real democratic structuring of state life and the working people headed by the working class possess absolute power. Lenin wrote that "socialism is merely state-capitalist monopoly *which is made to serve the interests of the whole people* and has to that extent ceased to be

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Greetings to Italian, French and German Communists," *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, 1965, p. 57.

² Helmut Köser, "Die Kontrolle wirtschaftlicher Macht". In: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Bonn, No. 14, 1974, pp. 3-25.

capitalist monopoly".¹ Hence it is clear that for such a transformation to take place it is necessary for the proletariat in alliance with the working people to take state power and set up a socialist state. Only under these circumstances will social production become socialist in character. Consequently it is a grave mistake to identify the state form of socialist ownership with state capitalism as do the social-democratic theoreticians.

Socialist social production objectively requires centralized state management. But this management is not built on the blind, forcible subjection of the interests of the collective and the individual, as the social-democratic ideologists try to claim, but on their conscious accord with the interests of society insofar as they are the same and primarily based on relations of social ownership. This in its turn requires the broad development of initiative both from the collective and the individual.

All these tasks are fulfilled through the implementation of the principle of democratic centralism, the importance of which is stressed in Article 3 of the Constitution of the USSR. The essence of this principle consists in a combination of democracy and the broad initiative of the working people together with centralized planning and individual responsibility of the executives. It implies planning, discipline and organization.

In stressing the importance of state management of the economy and other spheres of social life, and acting on the Leninist principle of democratic centralism, the Communist Party of the USSR at the same time pays considerable attention to drawing the masses into direct participation in management in the collectives in which they work.

In noting the importance of including in the text of the Constitution an article on the role of the work collectives, General Secretary of the CC CPSU and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Leonid Brezhnev stressed: "This reflects a major policy line of the Party and the importance it attaches to the development of democratic principles in managing production."²

A very important contribution towards collective self-management is made by the meetings of workers and white-collar workers which are regularly held to discuss all aspects of work at the factory. At these meetings various reports are delivered by executives, including representatives of ministries and departments.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Impeding Catastrophe and How to Combat It", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, 1974, p. 362.

² L. I. Brezhnev, *Our Course: Peace and Socialism*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1978, p. 68.

Increasing importance is being attached to the standing production conferences which meet at the factories at least eight times per year and on the shop floor once a month. These conferences discuss and seek out ways for improving inter-factory planning, raising workers' incomes, etc.

An effective means of worker participation in running the economy is the system of socialist emulation in which 97.5 million workers took part in 1977. The importance of socialist emulation is made particularly clear from the way in which the workers adopt and achieve counterplans. The drawing up of counterplans means ensuring that the work-force is well-informed of the planned targets for the collective. It also implies continually searching for fresh reserves, examining production capabilities and taking bold managerial decisions which are necessary for achieving higher work commitments.

Thus there are various forms of social activity designed to help encourage the working people on a wide scale to discuss questions relating to the economic life of society and the collective, to take decisions and to exercise control over their fulfilment (this is the essence of democratic management, of the political system of socialism as a whole).

The main pivot of the whole socialist political system is the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party. It does not rule over society and the state, but directs the work of the people as a whole towards the building of communism.

Consequently the leadership of the party, whose task it is to promote the all-round development of socialist democracy becomes the true guarantee of democracy under socialism. Much depends on the successful functioning of the party as well as the degree to which it correctly and opportunely perceives what is needed afresh for social progress and utilizes the various ways and means of guiding the masses. The guarantee of the achievement of this is the Communists' loyalty to Marxist-Leninist teaching, which has been tried and tested by experience, and the development of scientific communist theory.

An essential characteristic of socialist democracy consists not only in the fact that it proclaims the rights and political freedoms of the individual but also ensures their real guarantee in practice. Every citizen in socialist society, irrespective of social status, nationality or race, is guaranteed both political freedoms (freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly and meetings, and the right to vote and to be elected to the democratic institutions) and a wide range of social rights (the right to work, to rest and leisure, to free

education, to free medical care, to housing, to maintenance in old age and in sickness, the right to enjoy cultural benefits, etc.). This policy for the continued growth of public welfare is being successfully implemented.

The Constitution of the USSR fully reflects the humanity of the socialist state which, in conformity with the communist ideal that "The free development of each is the condition of the free development of all", aims to widen the real possibilities for the all-round development of the individual. A special section of the Constitution, entitled "The State and the Individual" contains a broad spectrum of citizens' rights and freedoms. As compared with the former 1936 Constitution the 1977 Constitution proclaims a fuller and more extensive range of rights, while the material guarantee of their exercise is surer and sounder. For example, the right to work has been supplemented by "the right to choose their trade or profession, type of job and work in accordance with their inclinations, abilities, training and education, with due account of the needs of society" (*Article 40*). Political rights and freedoms have been more fully formulated so that now citizens have the right to take part in the management and administration of state and public affairs, to make suggestions for improving the work of state and public bodies and to criticize shortcomings in their work. Persecution for criticism is prohibited.

The Constitution guarantees inviolability of the person and the home as well as privacy of correspondence, telephone conversations and telegraphic communications. It is the duty of all state bodies, public organizations and officials to respect the individual and respect the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens (*Article 57*).

It is from the humane nature of the connection between the individual and society during the period of developed socialism that the principle of the organic combination of social and personal interests stems. Every member of society can see that his labour becomes part of the common effort of all Soviet citizens to make their country more powerful, while the increase in social wealth brings about a rise in the well-being of each worker. The law of life in a society which consists only of working classes and social groups, as it says in the Preamble to the Constitution is "concern of all for the good of each and concern of each for the good of all".

Hence the combination of the real rights and freedoms of individuals with their duties and responsibilities as citizens, which is inherent in the Soviet way of life and which some of our critics fail to understand. The duties and responsibilities of citizens, as set down in the Constitution (such as the duty to work conscientiously,

preserve and protect socialist property, care for the upbringing of children, promote the strengthening of the might and prestige of the state, help in the maintenance of public order, be intolerant of anti-social behaviour, protect the natural environment, etc.), are in the vital interest of society as a whole and of the individual in particular.

The unity of personal and social interests is embodied both in the rights and duties of Soviet citizens. The equality and unity of these rights and duties is expressed in the fact that all citizens in the USSR in the words of *Article 34* of the Constitution "are equal before the law, without distinction of origin, social or property status, race or nationality, sex, education, language, attitude to religion, type and nature of occupation, domicile, or other status". In other words, there are no second class citizens in the Soviet Union, nor are there any citizens who enjoy only rights and have no duties to the state. In this way the principle of the founders of Marxism according to which "there are no rights without duties and no duties without rights"¹ becomes implemented.

The class essence of socialist democracy and of all the rights and freedoms, which it guarantees, consists in the fact that it ensures the protection of socialist gains and the prevention of any encroachment on the interests of the working class and all the working people.

Freedom from unemployment, exploitation, oppression and the arbitrary rule of the privileged classes together with the real existence of social rights and gains are the characteristic features of socialist democracy, which give it undoubted advantages over capitalism.

2. Improving the Social Structure and the Development of the State of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat into the Socialist State of the Whole People

The ideologists of social reformism try to distort the essence of existing socialism advancing various pseudo-scientific concepts of the social structure of socialist society.

While capitalist society is usually depicted by the right Social Democrats as some sort of "social ensemble" in which a "levelling" of status has taken place between the various social

¹ Karl Marx, "Provisorische Statuten der Internationalen Arbeiter-Assoziation". In: Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Vol. 16, Dietz Verlag Berlin, 1968, p. 15.

groups, socialist society in the USSR, according to them, is represented as a hierarchical pyramid with the "ruling elite" sitting on the top. Furthermore, they present the picture as if there were a struggle going on between the various social strata, groups and even so-called new classes in which the factual splits were deepening. A distorted picture is also given of the position of the working people, including the working class, who are characterized as the "faceless masses" and supposedly subjected to all kinds of political and technocratic manipulation from the so-called elite. In this way the right reformist ideologists try to distort the role of the working class in Soviet society.

They also give a distorted interpretation of the influence of politics on the social structure of socialist society claiming that political power there artificially creates a social structure and arbitrarily amends it according to its own requirements.

There is, of course, no doubt that under socialism the social processes do not take place spontaneously. The Communist Party and the Soviet state, relying on knowledge of the objective laws, try to consciously influence and improve the social structure of society. But this influence does not go towards creating the new exploitative classes and strata which have been thought up by the Social Democrats, but towards the further strengthening of the social unity of Soviet society in accordance with the gradual development of socialism into communism.

Developed socialist society in the USSR is socially homogeneous in the sense that it consists today of classes and social groups that are socialist by their nature. These are united by socialist ownership, collective labour and a community of radical interests and aims. Obviously this is not full social homogeneity, which can only be achieved in the highest phase of the communist social formation.

In a developed socialist society the drawing together of all classes and all social groups takes place on the basis of implementing the socialist interests and communist ideals of the working class. The working class has always been the main productive force of society. It is also a revolutionary, disciplined, organized and collective force, and this determines its leading position in the system of socialist social relations.

The leading position of the working class in conditions of developed socialism is organically linked with the strengthening of its union with the peasantry and the intelligentsia, with the increasing unity of all members of socialist society and the abolition of social and class distinctions.

These deep-going processes of social integration can be seen from the example of the Soviet people, which represents an historically new social community.

The deep changes that have taken place in the social and political life of Soviet society have provided the conditions for the transformation of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into the state of the whole people as well as the further development of socialist democracy.

The state of the whole people is the newest and highest stage in the development of the socialist state. Upon it lie the tasks of building communist society. Nevertheless, between it and the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat there exists deep historical continuity. The state of the whole people is carrying on under new conditions the great creative role of the state of proletarian dictatorship.¹

The ideological opponents of Marxism-Leninism, including the social reformists, try to compromise the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat claiming that it is synonymous with violence, terror, the repression of individual freedoms, etc. In this way they crudely distort its essence and try to use this distortion as a means of intimidating people who are unacquainted with the truth. Lenin exposed the slanderous falsifications of the ideological enemies of communism and frequently stressed that the dictatorship of the proletariat means not only violence (and then violence only against the resistance of the exploiting classes). "Its chief feature," he wrote, "is the organisation and discipline of the advanced contingent of the working people, of their vanguard; of their sole leader, the proletariat, whose object is to build socialism, abolish the division of society into classes, make all members of society working people, and remove the basis for all exploitation of man by man."² Hence the deeply humanistic character of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The working class by its very nature is the builder and creator of human values. It is compelled to apply force so as to crush the furious attempts of the overthrown classes to restore their past. Its power is based on dictatorship over the exploiters and democracy for the working people. Its social basis is an alliance between the

¹ See: *On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee of January 31, 1977*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1977, p. 13.

² V. I. Lenin "Greetings to the Hungarian Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 1974, p. 388.

working class and all the working people in the name of the building of socialism.¹

The criterion of democracy is the social nature of the state. Here the important points are: whose interest state power and social government express, whom they serve and what the degree of worker participation in the various forms of government and administration is.

Proletarian power guarantees real freedom for the working people from exploitation and cultural, national and political oppression. It establishes a new, socialist way of life which is permeated with genuine democratism.

Drawing the working people into management on a broad scale, ensuring their participation in the daily work of bodies of state power, making these bodies accountable to and controllable by public organizations and establishing the principle of publicity, criticism and self-criticism are characteristic features of political life in the socialist countries.

Despite the fact that Kautskian ideas on the incompatibility of the dictatorship of the proletariat and democracy have been refuted by Marxist-Leninist science and the practical experience of building socialism, despite the improvement of universal democracy which has taken place under conditions of mature socialism, social-democratic ideologists make extensive use of the slanderous concepts of the "totalitarian" and "authoritarian" character of the political system in the USSR and the other socialist countries. Furthermore, assertions of "party dictatorship", the "indentification of the party and the state" and "minority domination" have been consistently repeated by bourgeois propaganda, particularly in reacting to the new Soviet Constitution.²

The label "totalitarianism", which certain democratic socialist ideologists, following in the footsteps of the rampant anti-communists of the bourgeois camp, attach to the political system of existing socialism, shows that they are making speculative attempts to transfer to socialism those concepts and categories which were engendered by capitalism and belong to it alone. After all, fascism, as a system practicing the total repression of individual rights and freedoms, arose on the soil of capitalism.

¹ See: V. I. Lenin, "Foreword to the Published Speech 'Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality'", *Collected Works*. Vol. 29, 1974, p. 381.

² *Der Bund*, June 6, 1977; *Die Welt*, June 6, 1977; *La Tribune de Genève*, June 6, 1977.

What sort of "totalitarian" political organization is it, one might ask, when almost the whole adult population of the USSR in one way or another participates in the management of public affairs? The two-million-strong body of people's deputies at all levels of the Soviets, over 30 million activists of the Soviets, the trade unions, which comprise over 123 million members drawn from the workers, the peasants and the intelligentsia, the Young Communist League with its membership of 38 million young men and women, the cooperative societies embracing the entire peasantry, the various scientific, technical and creative organizations, and the people's control bodies with over 9 million are just some of the forms by which mass participation in management and administration is exercised in the Soviet Union today.

According to Article 9 of the Constitution, "The principal direction in the development of the political system of Soviet society is the extension of socialist democracy, namely ever broader participation of citizens in managing the affairs of society and the state, continuous improvement of the machinery of state, heightening of the activity of public organisations, strengthening of the system of people's control, consolidation of the legal foundations of the functioning of the state and of public life, greater openness and publicity, and constant responsiveness to public opinion." It is this orientation that provides the guidelines for the successful solution of the problems involved in creating communist social self-government.

The "democratic socialist" ideologists usually avoid giving a concrete analysis of the actual formation of the organs of Soviet power, their social composition, their fields of activity and the various means available for drawing the public into state administration, in fact of everything that goes to show the genuinely democratic nature of political power. But, on the other hand, the claim is frequently made in social-democratic literature that the Soviets, the trade unions and other public organizations play only an "insignificant" role in the Soviet political system. The facts, however, say otherwise.

The Soviets constitute the political foundation of the USSR. They function entirely on the principle of socialist democratism. The elected deputies to the Soviets are among the most merited members of society. In a developed socialist society the task of forming the organs of state power is in the hands of the working people, for in this society there are no classes or social groups which do not work. In the election campaigns which are run by the party organizations millions of people participate as confidential agents,

canvassers and members of the electoral commissions, etc.

The democratic character of the organs of state power in the USSR is shown by the composition of the Soviets. Thus of the deputies to the local Soviets in the 1977 elections, 42.3 per cent were workers, 26.1 per cent collective-farm workers, and the rest intellectuals of various kinds. Almost half the deputies (49 per cent) were women and almost one third were young people under 30. Of the deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR 34.8 per cent were workers, 16.3 per cent collective-farm workers and the remainder various sections of the intelligentsia.¹

The use of such democratic institutions as electoral mandates, deputies' reports to their constituents, reports by the heads of the state organs to work collectives and in residential neighbourhoods, and preliminary mass discussion of proposed new laws ensures that the public at large are drawn into the task of administration on the broadest possible scale.

The 1977 Constitution of the USSR stresses that the Soviet Union is a state of the whole people. As a result of this the Soviets of Working People's Deputies have been renamed the Soviets of People's Deputies. The democratic principles of the work of the Soviets have been extensively developed and their role in tackling the problems of state administration has increased. Thus the Supreme Soviet of the USSR is empowered to decide all matters relating to the conduct of state affairs, while the local Soviets decide not only questions of local significance, but also within the bounds of their competence control and coordinate the work of all organizations within their area. The Constitution obliges the Soviets to keep their electorate periodically informed on their work and make periodic accounts of their activities.

The Constitution guarantees a genuinely democratic combination of the common interests of the multinational Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the individual interests of each of its constituent republics. The Constitution determines the competence of the USSR as a whole, the Union republics, the autonomous republics, the autonomous regions and autonomous areas, and the Soviets of People's Deputies at all levels.

The further strengthening of the socialist state is organically linked with improving the work of the mass public organizations of the working people which are part of the political system of the Soviet Union.

In reflecting the growing role of the trade unions, the Young

¹ *Pravda*, March 7, 1979.

Communist League and the other mass public organizations, the Constitution of the USSR gives them broader rights, including the right to participate in decisions on political, economic, social and cultural matters.

Thus, we can see from the above the genuinely democratic character of the Soviet political system.

3. The Role of the Party in Socialist Society

After the complete and final victory of socialism, when the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat grows into the state of the whole people in which the leading role is played by the working class, the communist party becomes the vanguard not only of the working class, but also of the whole people. Although the party is numerically a minority of the people, it can be by no means considered a "closed elite" divorced from the masses. Take for example the social composition of the CPSU. In 1977 workers comprised 42 per cent, collective-farm workers 13.6 per cent and white-collar workers 44.4 per cent. Three quarters of the white-collar workers were engineers, technicians, agricultural specialists, teachers, doctors, scientists, writers and artists. A total of 73.2 per cent of party members were actually engaged in production.¹ In the communist and workers' parties of the other socialist countries those engaged in one form or another of material production similarly hold the leading place. Thus in the Bulgarian Communist Party they comprise 40.6 per cent, in the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party 59.2, in the Socialist Unity Party of Germany 56.6, in the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party 30, in the Polish United Workers' Party 40.9, in the Romanian Communist Party 48.4, and in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia 44.1 per cent.² As all these figures show the working class, the people are the flesh and blood of the communist parties, which are comprised of their most outstanding representatives.

Marxists-Leninists are opposed to both belittling the leading role of the party in the socialist society, particularly the limiting of its functions to purely cultural and educational activity, and to confusing the functions of state and party organs. The party carries out its policies through the party organizations and through the Communists who work in the state and economic organs and throughout all levels of the new society. Furthermore, as it is clearly

¹ See *Partiinaya zhizn*, No. 21, 1977, pp. 28, 34.

² See *World Marxist Review*, No. 4, 1976, p. 91.

stated in the Rules of the CPSU, the party organizations do not replace the Soviet, trade union, cooperative and other public organizations, and they do not confuse the functions of party and other organs thereby avoiding unnecessary duplication of their work. The essence of this policy is clearly expressed in the Constitution of the USSR which states: "All party organisations shall function within the framework of the Constitution of the USSR" (Article 6).

The guiding role of the Marxist-Leninist party is a general law of socialist and communist construction. Whether this role is exercised by a one-party system or by several workers' parties that are all concerned with the building of socialism is considered by Marxists-Leninists to be a matter of the specific historical conditions and peculiarities of a given country.

After the victory of the October Revolution in 1917 Lenin, for example, considered that an "honest coalition" was possible between the Bolsheviks and the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries on condition that the latter loyally and honourably observed the principles of Soviet power. "*We have invited and continue to invite the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries to share power with us. It is not our fault that they have refused.*"¹ But convinced from their experience in the fierce class struggle that the Mensheviks and the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries were in fact counter-revolutionary, the working people rejected all their pretensions to leadership of the masses and came to recognize only one party, the Bolshevik Party, as playing the leading role in the state and society.

"Democratic socialist" assertions that the one-party system as in the USSR is the only type of political system imposed by Marxists-Leninists on all countries, are completely unfounded as are anti-communist prescriptions for "liberalizing" the socialist system by means of the introduction of the kind of "pluralist democracy" that is characteristic of bourgeois society.

Events, however, have shown that both one-party and multi-party systems can exist in the socialist countries and that this depends on the specific conditions of each individual country.

But a socialist multi-party system is radically different from the bourgeois pluralist multi-party system.

The work of all parties towards the triumph of socialism implies their cooperation. On this basis comradely relations are built between the parties that form the multi-party system. In the GDR,

the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Bulgaria, Poland, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Czechoslovakia there are several democratic parties and their representatives hold important public and state positions as well as being members of the government.

Wherever there is an essentially socialist multi-party system, it plays an important and positive role in drawing the working people into state administration.

The popular front—a mass socio-political organization which arose in a number of socialist countries during the course of the national liberation struggle—has also demonstrated its vitality and importance. The fraternal communist parties are highly appreciative of the work of the popular front and have made no attempt to do away with the democratic forces which comprise it, but on the contrary have tried to create the best possible conditions for their participation in political life.

In their attacks on the socialist political system the "democratic socialist" ideologists have involuntarily expressed the desire to transplant the bourgeois model of "pluralist democracy" onto the soil of socialism. But this desire is unattainable.

The democracy of this or that political system or this or that way of life must be judged less by the number of parties that take part in political life but rather by the degree to which government expresses the true interests of the nation and by the level of the socio-political activity of the masses.

The political activity of the masses in the capitalist countries is limited in every possible way. Furthermore, under a "pluralist" bourgeois democracy (let alone a fascist regime) this is accompanied by various forms of political discrimination (against the Communists, for instance) and especially the variety of means of pressure on the masses engendered by the bourgeois way of life and its social basis.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "From the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, 1964, p. 306.

Chapter V

THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE IN THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT AND THE PROBLEM OF LEFT UNITY TODAY

1. The Principles of Cooperation Between Communists and Social Democrats

Recent events have shown that a fierce ideological struggle is going on over the concept of "democratic socialism". On the one hand stand those forces which are virtually trying to adapt the social-democratic movement to suit the needs of capitalist society founded on private ownership of the means of production. On the other hand, there are those forces which are striving to overcome the vices of capitalism and create conditions in which there would be no exploitation of the working people. These complex processes of differentiation which are taking place in international social democracy have been the subject of study by Marxist science.

Communists have a deep sense of responsibility for the fate of mankind and progress and on this basis the communist parties are in favour of unity in the ranks of the international working-class movement, an important part of which is composed of social-democratic workers and their mass organizations. Difference in approach to an understanding of the nature of socialism and the ways to its achievement should not serve as an obstacle to struggle against the enemy of all mankind, international imperialism, which threatens the world with a new war and people everywhere with new forms of exploitation and oppression. In showing the fundamental mistakenness of those interpretations of "democratic socialism" which imply selling out to capitalism and in exposing right social-democratic reformism which would lead the working people away from the revolutionary struggle for the radical transformation of capitalist society, Communists welcome all those moves in the direction of a real understanding of socialism, at the basis of which lie the triumphant ideas of the working class and the creation of a society on the principles of genuine democracy guaranteeing each worker the possibility of working, building and running society and expressing feelings of solidarity.

The attitude of the international communist movement towards social democracy was clearly formulated at the world communist conferences of 1957, 1960 and 1969. Questions of strengthening unity among the working class and developing mutual relations between the communist and social-democratic parties occupied an important place on the agenda of the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe held in Berlin on June 29-30, 1976. The final document of the Conference noted: "The participants in the Conference welcome the successes achieved in a number of countries and at international levels in developing cooperation between communist and socialist or social-democratic parties. They consider that the basic interests of the working class and of all working people require the overcoming of the obstacles which stand in the way of cooperation and which complicate the struggle of the mass of working people against monopoly capital and against the reactionary and conservative forces."¹ At the same time it was stressed that the participant communist and workers' parties repeat the confirmation of the intention to reject any policies or views which amount to selling out the working class to the capitalist system.

The Soviet view was outlined in the Report of the Central Committee to the 25th Congress of the CPSU. Speaking at the Congress, L. I. Brezhnev declared: "In accordance with the guidelines of the 24th Congress we continued to extend our ties with *progressive non-Communist parties*—revolutionary-democratic and also left-socialist. Our contacts with the socialist and social-democratic parties of a number of countries, including Finland, Belgium, Japan, Britain and France, have noticeably expanded. We appreciate the progress made in this domain and shall continue to work in the same direction.

"Certainly, there can be no question of any ideological convergence between scientific communism and the reformism of the social-democrats. There are still too many among the social-democrats who base their entire activity on anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. There are even parties which discipline their members for communicating with Communists. We shall combat these things because they only play into the hands of reaction.

"However, we can be and are united with social-democrats, conscious of their responsibility for peace, and all the more with social-democratic workers, by a common concern for the security

¹ *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe. Berlin, June 29—30, 1976, p. 42.*

of the peoples, a wish to contain the arms race, and to repulse fascism, racialism and colonialism. It is precisely on this plane that we displayed and will continue to display initiative and goodwill."¹

The point of view of the West European communist parties for whom the problem of cooperation with the Social Democrats is particularly relevant, since it is in these countries that the most influential Socialist International parties are concentrated, is reflected in the Political Declaration of the Brussels Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of the Capitalist Countries of Europe (January 26-28, 1974).

"The Communist Parties in the European capitalist countries stress their desire to establish ... contacts with the socialist and social-democratic parties, hold joint consultations and undertake joint action towards the achievement of aims that meet the vital requirements of the working people and are in the interests of security and coöperation in Europe."²

The correlation between the necessity of waging ideological struggle against social-democratic reformism and the need for joint action between the communist and social-democratic parties can be seen from the following points:

- the communist parties hold principled ideological positions;
- a process of differentiation is taking place in the ranks of the Social Democrats;
- the idea of the "necessity for far-reaching political and economic changes" is spreading and exercising a positive influence over relations between the workers and the forces of democracy;
- it is necessary to undertake a careful study of those interpretations of "democratic socialism", which depart from the basic concept as drawn up by the right Social Democrats, and make use of them in determining a strategy for left-wing unity. At the same time it is necessary to take account both of historical experience on the present matter and the specific characteristics of the concrete situation in which organizational questions relating to joint action are tackled.

2. The Main Stages in the History of Cooperation Between the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties

The attitude of the Social Democrats towards contacts with the communist parties has undergone a certain degree of evolution over the years.

¹ *Documents and Resolutions XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 28-39.
² *L'Humanité*, January 30, 1974.

It has in fact taken decades for many social-democratic politicians to recognize the right of the communist parties to equal partnership with them in the struggle to change capitalist society.

The period from 1919 to 1922 was a "wait-and-see" period for the Social Democrats, and although there were anti-Soviet and anti-communist attacks made against Soviet Russia and the Comintern, the period was comparatively "peaceful". In 1922 the Social Democrats agreed to negotiations between the three Internationals. After the collapse of these talks, which they were instrumental in bringing about, the Social Democrats underwent a sharp change of position.

The period from 1923 to 1928 saw an escalation of anti-communism and the complete rejection of all initiatives from the communist parties and the Communist International.

The early 1930s saw a more realistic approach on the part of the Labour and Socialist International parties towards the communist parties and the Comintern. This change was brought about by a process of differentiation in the ranks of the Social Democrats and the massive swing to the left which came as the result of the world economic crisis and the advent of fascist rule in Germany. It was in 1933 that the Labour and Socialist International made its first offer to the Comintern for direct negotiations.

The period from 1933 to 1935 was characterized by a new strengthening of anti-communism on the part of the leadership of the Labour and Socialist International. But the objective situation and the demands of the class struggle together with the threat of war posed by fascism forced the Labour and Socialist International politicians to allow their parties to make contacts with sections of the Comintern.

From 1935 to 1939 a united front was set up like the Popular Front in France and the united anti-fascist actions in support of the republican government in Spain. During these years a variety of forms and methods of cooperation between the communist and social-democratic parties yielded many advantages.

From 1939 to 1941 the Labour and Socialist International underwent an organizational and ideological crisis that resulted in its break-up. Dialogue with the communist parties was broken off.

The period from 1941 to 1945 saw close relations between Communists and Social Democrats who worked together in the Resistance movement and in the struggle against fascist occupation.

Directly influenced by the lessons of the Second World War a significant number of Social Democrats came out in favour of

cooperation with the communist parties between 1945 and 1947. This led to politicians of both political currents holding seats in the governments of a number of countries, particularly Italy and France. The first postwar conference held in 1946, with 19 socialist parties participating, declared its wish for close cooperation with the communist parties of Europe and the USSR, and in the same year it was even proposed to include a provision in the constitution of the future Socialist International on unity of action with the communist parties.

But by 1947 a number of West European social-democratic parties were heading for a break with the communist parties and trying to oust Communists from their seats in government. The leaders of the majority of social-democratic parties aligned themselves with the cold war programme against the Communists and went over to the anti-communist imperialist camp. In 1948 those social-democratic parties that still cooperated with the communist parties were excluded from the Committee of the International Socialist Conference (founded in 1947). The Frankfurt Declaration of the Socialist International which was adopted in 1951 was blatantly anti-communist. Throughout the 1950s all contacts with communist parties were banned and this ban was directly stipulated in the Declaration adopted at the Socialist International Conference in Oslo in 1962.

Since 1962 there has been a gradual tendency towards setting up a constructive dialogue with the communist parties, particularly the CPSU. This has led to the official recognition by the Socialist International Bureau of the right of each member party to freely engage in bi-lateral relations with other parties.¹ But this was by no means a steady process. Although a number of Socialist International parties, like the French, Finnish and Japanese, had by the mid-sixties taken a number of practical steps towards unity of action with the Communists, the right-wing leadership still managed at the 11th Congress of the Socialist International, held at Eastbourne in 1969, to pass a sharply anti-communist resolution, entitled "Development in Communist Countries and Parties".²

This position taken by the Socialist International is largely explained by the fact that the right-wing leadership was trying to use anti-communist propaganda to neutralize the swing to the left among the rank-and-file members of the socialist and social-democratic parties, particularly the younger generation.

¹ Socialist Affairs, Vol XXII, No. 6-8, 1972, p. 113.

² Socialist International Information, Vol. XIX, No. 14, 1969.

But as later events were to show this resolution could not hold back the swing to the left in the social-democratic movement, which was taking place under the influence of the world revolutionary process. Parallel to the anti-communist line during this period there was another tendency towards holding dialogue with the communist parties. This found its expression in the position adopted at the Eastbourne Congress by Kalevi Sorsa, Secretary of the Finnish Social Democratic Party, and Ernest Glinne, the representative of the Belgian Socialist Party. Glinne in particular declared: "We must be logical with ourselves and give preference to our support of political democracy instead of tacit support for an anti-communist line, which is absolutely vicious...."¹

The differences of opinion among members of the Socialist International on contacts and cooperation with the communist parties surfaced at a Socialist International seminar which was held in Austria in December 1970 and which was attended by prominent representatives from the majority of social-democratic parties. At the seminar representatives of the Italian Socialist Party and the Finnish Social Democratic Party expressed fundamental approval of holding talks with the communist parties and cooperating with them. The SDPG, on the other hand, adopted an approach which was characterized by a desire to limit contacts with the Communists to the "minimum necessary level". A third approach was that of the Italian Social Democratic Party and the United Workers' Party of Israel which insisted on absolute rejection of all contacts with communist parties.

In April 1972 in Amsterdam the Bureau of the Socialist International adopted a resolution according to which each member party of the Socialist International was fully entitled to decide the question on bi-lateral relations with other parties (by which was meant chiefly the communist parties).

The strengthening of this tendency towards cooperation with the communist parties was reflected at the 12th Congress of the Socialist International, which took place in Vienna in late June 1972. Hans Janitschek, General Secretary of the Socialist International, stated in his report that as a result of international development and the new situation in a number of countries, the question of relations between the Social Democrats and the Communists "has once more appeared on the agenda".² Kalevi

¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. XIX, No. 16-17, 1969, p. 167.

² *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, June 27, 1972.

Sorsa, Secretary of the Finnish Social Democratic Party, pointing to the positive experience of cooperation between Communists and Social Democrats in his own country, emphasized the necessity for a constructive approach to the matter of cooperation with the communist parties.

Since then new developments have begun to take place in relations between the two sections of the working-class movement. In the first place there has been a widening of contacts with the communist parties in the socialist countries. Second, there has been an increase in the number of capitalist countries where cooperation between communist and social-democratic parties in various forms and at various levels has been taking place with the agreement and the approval of the leadership of both parties. Third, in some of these countries this cooperation has been widened. Fourth, contacts have been strengthened even in those countries where there is an official ban on such contacts by the social-democratic leadership.

The leadership of the Socialist International has been forced to approve both the eastern policy of the SDPG and, what is particularly important, the practical joint efforts by Communists and Socialists in Chile, and the joint government programme of the French Socialist Party and the French Communist Party.

Since 1972 there has been a significant broadening of relations—and this at their own initiative—between the majority of Socialist International parties and the CPSU and the communist parties in the other socialist countries, particularly over questions of European security.

Delegations from a number of Socialist International parties have held constructive exchanges of opinion on various questions with the CPSU. These delegations recognized the possibility and necessity for agreement during future talks on steps towards strengthening peace and promoting social progress.

From September 30 to October 4, 1979, Moscow played host to the Socialist International Working Group on Disarmament. The Group's visit to the USSR was prompted by the urgent need to step up struggle for disarmament and detente. It was the first visit of its kind and was therefore of signal importance.

The delegation was received by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Brezhnev, and had an important talk with him.

In the CPSU Central Committee, the delegation met the Alternate Member of the CPSU Central Committee's Politbureau,

Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. B. N. Ponomarev, Alternate Members of the CPSU Central Committee G. A. Arbatov, V. V. Zagladin, and N. N. Inozemtsev, and Deputy Chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, V. S. Shaposhnikov.

The Group's members also discussed disarmament problems with Soviet public figures and disarmament experts.

The Soviet participants in the meetings and members of the Socialist International Working Group reaffirmed their support for detente and agreed on the necessity to stop immediately the arms race and piling up of armaments and substantially to reduce nuclear and conventional weapons arsenals and sales. The participants coordinated their standpoints on the need drastically to reduce armaments and ensure an equal security of the sides, to establish effective control over compliance of the disarmament agreements and to divert the resources released by slowing the arms race to peaceful purposes.

But all this is far from meaning that the Socialist International is ready to depart from the ideology, principles and aims of "democratic socialism" as is affirmed by the continuing attacks on Marxism-Leninism and the attempts to step up psychological warfare against Communists and their political influence. Thus although the renewal of talks between Social Democrats and Communists in Finland was announced in 1974 (and the January plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Finland had affirmed its desire to achieve unity of action with the Finnish Social Democratic Party on a number of questions) the subsequent position of the Finnish Social Democratic Party proved inconsistent. The right wing of the Party stepped up its activity and its press launched an anti-communist campaign.

In Portugal the process of expanding joint action between the Social Democrats and the Communists has also met with difficulties. Accusations of totalitarianism and hegemonism have been made against the Communists by some members of the Portuguese Socialist Party.

At the two most recent Socialist International congresses (June 1976 and November 1978) relations with the communist parties have directly or indirectly appeared on the agenda, and once again the two positions, representing two factions of the social-democratic movement, clashed. But what was significant about these congresses was that discussion no longer centred around the question of cooperation or non-cooperation with the communist parties, but rather the level of cooperation to be permitted.

3. Communist Efforts to Expand Joint Action with the Social Democrats

The international communist movement has become the most influential political force in the world today and a crucial factor of social progress. It is armed with a theory whose scientific reliability has been corroborated by more than a century of social development—the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the Communists' true compass showing humanity's way ahead in a changing world.

At the same time allowance should be made for the fact that a good many workers in some capitalist countries belong not only to the communist parties but to socialist and social-democratic parties, and that the mass of the workers are members of unions, through which they become associated with communist, socialist and social-democratic parties. Acceleration of the revolutionary process depends to a great extent on international working-class solidarity, and the struggle to build up this solidarity is being waged under difficult conditions. Deep-going political and ideological contradictions exist between the communist parties, on the one hand, and the socialist and social-democratic parties, on the other. Fighting for working-class unity entails a great deal of hard, day-to-day ideological and political work for the most advanced sections of the working class.

In seeking joint action with the social-democratic parties, Communists are pursuing no particular ambitions or interests apart from those of the working class. The purpose of cooperation in the eyes of Communists is not to cause a split in the socialist parties, as certain social-democratic leaders try to claim, but to increase the force of the whole working class and strengthen its position and influence in society.

The Socialists and Social Democrats in countries where the communist parties' positions are particularly strong do sometimes show an inclination to work with the Communists. This is happening mainly in France and Italy. In these countries the process of uniting efforts in the struggle against monopoly capital has entered a new stage and resulted in coordinated practical action against the bourgeoisie.

United action by the working class is more difficult to achieve in countries where the social-democratic parties have a strong hold on the masses. Here, too, of course, the social-democratic movement does cooperate with the Communists to a certain extent. Such cooperation takes place at factories, in the unions, during strikes, at the municipal level, in manifestations for peace and social rights,

and in actions against reactionary moves in home and foreign policy. However, at the level of parties and even of local organizations the right-wing leaders of social democracy often reject cooperation with the Communists in principle. They believe that since most of the workers belong to the social-democratic parties, and the unions connected with them, unity already exists. But unity is a class concept. The working-class movement needs it in order to assert its class independence in the struggle against the bourgeois system. This is the kind of unity sought by the Communists, and the road towards it lies through activation and rallying of all the left forces in the social-democratic parties and trade unions, all those who remain true to socialist aims, to the idea of developing unity of action among communist, socialist and social-democratic organizations of the working people.

There can be no doubt that in comparison with the situation in the past, especially during the cold war, there have been certain positive shifts in the orientation of a number of influential social-democratic parties, particularly in such important spheres as detente, European security and peaceful coexistence. In other spheres the positive shifts have not been so much in evidence. The leadership of the social-democratic parties, including those that are in power, find it impossible to repudiate the theory and practice of cooperation with the monopoly bourgeoisie and protection of state-monopoly capitalism. Anti-communism is still an important weapon in the right-wing Social Democrats' ideological and political armoury, although some Social Democrats seem to sense the short-sightedness of this policy and are shedding many of their former anti-communist prejudices. However, they still regard opposition to scientific socialism as one of the main lines of their ideological activity. While the communist parties, true to Marxism-Leninism, steadily continue to put the principles of scientific socialism into practice, broadening and enriching them in the course of practical socialist construction, the right-wing Socialists and Social Democrats reject the basic Marxist-Leninist propositions on the essence of socialism and try to counter them with the concept of "democratic socialism", that is to say, a hotch-potch of reformist, revisionist and liberal-bourgeois ideas.

The course of history, however, offers good grounds for maintaining that the cause and ideas of existing socialism are winning through. Ever wider sections of the working people are coming to see in socialism the most humane and perfect structure of society that has yet been achieved. The massive swing of public

opinion towards socialism and also the fact that many Social Democrats acknowledge that socialism exists and is developing in the USSR and other socialist countries offer increasing scope for a dialogue between Communists and Social Democrats.

The communist parties believe that a successful joint struggle requires a definite programme of united action upon which both sides are agreed. This is one of the most difficult and complex problems of cooperation.

But the fact that this problem is in principle solvable has been shown by the numerous joint actions undertaken by Communists and Socialists in France. These led in 1972 to the signing of a joint governmental programme. During the economic crisis that shook that country in 1977 the Communist Party suggested renewing this joint governmental programme in preparation for the parliamentary elections. But the Socialist Party refused serious discussion of the Communist Party's suggestions thereby threatening the further implementation of the joint governmental programme. Nevertheless, as the Central Committee of the French Communist Party noted in a resolution at its extended plenary meeting: "The Communist Party is striving to reach agreement between parties on the left on the basis of an updated joint programme. It has tried to achieve this agreement during the negotiations with the Socialist Party and the Left Radical Movement and for the sake of this has gone to the limit in its concessions. But there can be absolutely no question of going beyond the limit, for then, a left-wing government would no longer have at its disposal the means to effect those changes which the working people expect."

Between the Communists and the Social Democrats there exists an objective possibility for determining a general political line on questions that go beyond the framework of a single capitalist country. Such questions include strengthening peace and security, the activities of the multinational corporations and processes of integration.

It is worth noting that the social-democratic theoreticians are more and more coming to make the problem of monopoly domination the subject of their researches and to include it in their programme documents.

What conclusions do they come to?

First, that the activities of the international monopolies present the social-democratic movement with a number of problems, insofar as they promote ideological values that are radically different from those of "democratic socialism".

¹ *L'Humanité*, November 11, 1977.

Second, that although the international monopolies promote the spread of new technology, they nevertheless create difficulties for governments trying to pursue national policies, owing to their position of dominance in the world markets and their manipulation of prices.

These conclusions, of course, contain elements that are similar to the Communists' views on the international monopolies. This clearly points not only to the necessity but also to the possibility for joint action between Social Democrats and Communists in the struggle against monopoly capitalism, a conclusion which is favoured by a number of practical suggestions on limiting the power of the monopolies.

The Social Democrats themselves have been forced to recognize that their parties in power are impotent in a number of important fields, particularly when they try to pursue policies that are in conformity with the fundamentals of "democratic socialism", since they are continually dependent economically on the international monopolies.

The problem of unity of the left in the anti-monopoly struggle is essentially a matter of whether joint action by Social Democrats and Communists is a fundamental strategic policy, or is of a temporary, tactical nature.

Communists for their part have always stressed the fundamental, strategic character of an alliance with all anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist forces that in substance oppose the doomed capitalist system. Communists believe that while a significant section of the working people for one reason or another remain within the sphere of the socialist or social-democratic parties, it is their duty, as a party that reflects the radical interests of all the working people, to unite the working people irrespective of what party they belong to and do everything they can to promote the satisfaction of their present and future demands. For this reason the communist parties have, at all stages of their activity, supported unity of action with the socialist and social-democratic parties in the name of the vital interests of the working people and the creation of a united anti-imperialist front. Consequently Communists see union with the Socialists and Social Democrats not as a temporary, tactical measure, but as a strategic, long-term goal, which is designed to stabilize a united front.

There are also influential forces in the international social-democratic movement that support joint action with the communist parties in the name of a united working class. Thus Francesco De Martino, former General Secretary of the Italian

Socialist Party, demanded that there should be an immediate comparison of views with other parties, particularly the Italian Communist Party, because the "need for unity has become more pressing than ever before" and the Italian Socialist Party ought to "reject pernicious competition with the Communist Party for it was unnatural and dictated by irrational emotion".¹ On the same problem, the organ of the Finnish Social Democratic Party *Suomen sosiali demokraatti* called for an examination of relations between the two main trends in the working-class movement "from the point of view of cooperation". "Today," stated the paper, "there is not so much prejudice towards cooperation as previously. Everyone whose attitude to the working-class movement is serious ought to be clear about the fact that cooperation is not simply an empty word which can be repeated to achieve overall satisfaction, but that the quality and magnitude will one day be questions posed in concrete terms."²

As distinct from the communist parties, however, the majority of socialist and social-democratic parties look upon alliance as a temporary phenomenon to suit the needs of the moment. This was made particularly plain at the conferences in Helsingör and Paris in 1976 at which the various parties seemed to be divided between the South European countries which favoured dialogue with the Communists and the North European countries which rejected it. Of particular interest at the two conferences was the polemic conducted between these two factions in the socialist and social-democratic parties, in the course of which the South European representatives rejected the "advice" of the North European countries to decline any contact with the communist parties, stating that in their countries the solution of any serious social and political problems was impossible without the participation of the communist parties. At the same time they pointed to the necessity of an alliance with the Communists because of the latter's important political influence. The North Europeans not being faced with the same problems were therefore more intractable on this matter. Thus even the proponents of such an alliance justify it as being caused by objective necessity.

But despite the diametrically opposed viewpoints on such an important question the formation of an alliance of forces will continue if only for the fact that the working people need unity.

¹ *Avanti!* October 20, 1977.

² *Suomen Sosiali demokraatti*, October 21, 1977.

Those socialist parties that underestimate the significance of this objective process, which is dictated by the logic of the struggle of two antagonistic class forces that are becoming increasingly consolidated against one another, risk losing their influence among the working class and their political identity.

The possibility of Communists holding seats in the governments of Italy and France brought the bourgeois reactionaries almost to the point of panic. General Alexander Haig, the former commander of NATO forces in Europe, US Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and President Carter himself made direct threats against these countries, which were naturally understood by the world at large as flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of other states. It is noteworthy that these people always look upon themselves as upholders of democracy and protectors of freedoms, etc., but as soon as it is a matter of the people democratically giving Communists the right to a seat in government, the "democracy" of these gentlemen remains only in the memory.

But, of course, there is nothing unusual about the bourgeoisie opposing the communist parties. But when social-democratic governments go to the point of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, this is a serious blow to the unity of not only the working people in the countries in whose affairs they intervene but of all anti-imperialist forces. It is such a position that has been adopted by Chancellor Schmidt of the FRG, Vice-Chairman of the SDPG, who declared that if the Communists came to power in Italy, economic sanctions would have to be taken against that country. This declaration brought a storm of indignation throughout the world, including the socialist and social-democratic circles.

It is the strategy of the international bourgeoisie to cause a split in the working-class movement, irrespective of whether this requires intervention in the internal affairs of those countries, where unity of the left and communist participation in government are a definite possibility. But this strategy is resolutely opposed by the communist parties, which pursue a revolutionary policy for strengthening unity of action in the working-class movement on the principles of the class struggle, and fight insistently for an end to enmity and rivalry between workers' parties and organizations and for the achievement of lasting cooperation between Communists and Social Democrats.

CONCLUSION

The international situation today shows convincingly that as mankind prepares to enter the third millennium A. D. it has resolutely entered on the path of the socialist transformation of society. In those countries where political power is held by parties that consistently defend the interests of the working people, the problems of creating a new society are being solved in practice. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has consistently implemented the Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist construction and development. It is no exaggeration to say that the greatest service that the CPSU, the working class and all the working people of the USSR perform is that they uphold and carry out Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialism. They uphold the principles of scientific communism in the struggle against the concepts of "democratic", "market" or "humane" socialism, on the one hand, and against "barrack-room socialism", which has found its ugliest expression in Maoism, on the other. The other socialist countries too achieved outstanding success in the building of a new socialist society and in the struggle against their opponents.

The building of socialist society on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory takes place within the principled struggle against conscious or unconscious distortion of socialist ideas and attempts to represent such distortion as some kind of a "third way", which is supposedly different from capitalism and socialism. In fulfilling the behests of Lenin, Soviet Communists use as their main argument in the struggle against the ideological opponents of socialism, the very successes that the Soviet people have achieved in the course of the building of socialism in the USSR. As it is stated in the Constitution, in the USSR a developed socialist society has

been built. At this stage, when socialism is developing on its own foundations, the creative forces of the new system and the advantages of the socialist way of life are becoming increasingly evident, and the working people are more and more widely enjoying the fruits of their great revolutionary gains.

It is a society in which powerful productive forces and progressive science and culture have been created, in which the well-being of the people is constantly rising, and more and more favourable conditions are being provided for the all-round development of the individual.

It is a society of mature socialist social relations, in which, on the basis of the drawing together of all classes and social strata and of the juridical and factual equality of all its nations and nationalities and their fraternal cooperation, a new historical community of people has been formed—the Soviet people.

It is a society of high organizational capacity, ideological commitment, and consciousness of the working people, who are patriots and internationalists.

It is a society in which the law of life is concern of all for the good of each and concern of each for the good of all.

It is a society of true democracy, the political system of which ensures effective management of all public affairs, ever more active participation of the working people in running the state, and the combining of citizens' real rights and freedoms with their obligations and responsibility to society.

Page 106, line 19
from top

ERRATUM

Should read:
government in the FRG has not
touched the relations of property
and

The book exposes the theoretical and practical untenability of the reformist, revisionist and bourgeois-liberal ideas brought together under the umbrella of "democratic socialism". The authors demonstrate the pseudo-socialist character of this doctrine which is designed to camouflage with socialist phraseology pro-capitalist policies of social reformism aimed at pushing the working-class movement off the true road of struggle for socialism. The remodelling of society along genuine socialist lines is shown as constituting the highest form of the development of democracy.



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS MOSCOW

